

The Subjunctive Mood in Arabic Grammatical Thought

BY
ARIK SADAN

BRILL

The Subjunctive Mood in Arabic
Grammatical Thought

Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics

Editorial board

T. Muraoka, A.D. Rubin and C.H.M. Versteegh

VOLUME 66

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.nl/ssl

The Subjunctive Mood in Arabic Grammatical Thought

By
Arik Sadan



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Sadan, Arik.

The subjunctive mood in Arabic grammatical thought / by Arik Sadan.

p. cm. — (Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics ; v. 66)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-23295-2 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-23423-9 (e-book) 1. Arabic language—Verb. 2. Arabic language—Mood. 3. Arabic language—Grammar—History. I. Title.

PJ6145.S23 2012

492.7'56—dc23

2012020411

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0081-8461

ISBN 978 90 04 23295 2 (hardback)

ISBN 978 90 04 23423 9 (e-book)

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Preface	xi
 I 'An	 1
1. Introduction	1
2. 'An as a Particle that Induces <i>naşb</i> in the Following Verb, and with it Occupies the Position of a <i>maşdar</i>	3
3. The Syntactic and Semantic Contexts of ' <i>an al-muxaffafa</i> Compared to ' <i>an al-maşdariyya</i>	16
4. The Separation Between <i>naşb</i> -Inducing ' <i>an</i> and the Following Verb	33
5. Conclusion	34
 II <i>Lan</i>	 37
1. Introduction	37
2. The Etymology of <i>lan</i>	38
3. The Mood of the Verb Following <i>lan</i>	45
4. The Utterance <i>lan yaf'ala</i> is a Negation of the Utterance <i>sayaf'alu/sawfa yaf'alu</i>	50
5. The Separation Between <i>lan</i> and the Following Verb	56
6. Conclusion	57
 III <i>Kay</i>	 59
1. Introduction	59
2. The Meaning of <i>kay</i>	60
3. The Mood of the Verb Following <i>kay</i>	61
4. The Time Conveyed by the Verb Following <i>kay</i>	62
5. The Separation Between <i>kay</i> and the Following Verb	63
6. Is There an ' <i>an muḍmara</i> after <i>kay</i> ?	65
7. The Mood of the Verb Following <i>kaymā</i>	70
8. Can the Verb Following <i>kamā</i> be in <i>naşb</i> ?	72
9. Conclusion	77
 IV ' <i>Idan</i>	 79
1. Introduction	79
2. The Orthography of ' <i>idan</i> : إِذَا or إِذْ ?	80

3. Is <i>'idan</i> a <i>ḥarf</i> 'Particle' or an <i>ism</i> 'Noun'?	83
4. Is <i>'idan</i> Etymologically a Noun Ending with a <i>tanwīn</i> (derived from <i>'id</i> or <i>'idā</i>), an Independent Word, a Compound of <i>'id</i> and <i>'an</i> or a Compound of <i>'id</i> and the Suffix <i>-n</i> ?	84
5. The Grammarians' Definition of <i>'idan</i> and its Meaning	88
6. How and Under What Conditions <i>'idan</i> Influences the Following Verb	92
7. Is there an <i>'an muḍmara</i> after <i>'idan</i> ?	101
8. The Instances of <i>'idan</i> in the Qur'ān	102
9. The Historical Development in the Status of <i>'idan</i> as an <i>'āmil</i> among Speakers of Certain Dialects of Old Arabic	104
10. Conclusion	107
 V <i>'Aw</i>	111
1. Introduction	111
2. Sentence Types in which <i>'aw</i> can be Followed by a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb, and the Possibility of Putting this Verb in <i>raf'</i>	112
3. The Meaning of <i>'aw</i> Followed by a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb	117
4. What Induces the Verb Following <i>'aw</i> to be <i>manṣūb</i> ?	121
5. The Separation between <i>'aw</i> and the Following Verb	123
6. Conclusion	124
 VI <i>Fa-</i>	127
1. Introduction	127
2. The Mood of the Verb Following <i>fa-</i>	129
3. Sentence Types in which a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb can Follow <i>fa-</i> and the Meaning of <i>naṣb</i>	135
4. Sentence Types in which a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb cannot Follow <i>fa-</i>	159
5. Comparison Between Sentence Types in which the <i>jawāb</i> Following <i>fa-</i> is <i>majzūm</i> and <i>manṣūb</i>	164
6. Dialectal Differences Related to the Mood of the Verb Following <i>fa-</i>	167
7. What Induces the Verb Following <i>fa-</i> to be <i>manṣūb</i> ?	168
8. Conclusion	170
 VII <i>Wa-</i>	173
1. Introduction	173
2. The Mood of the Verb Following <i>wa-</i>	174

3. Sentence Types in which a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb can Follow <i>wa-</i> and the Meaning of <i>naṣb</i>	177
4. The Meaning of <i>wa-</i> Followed by a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb	186
5. Sentence Types in which a <i>manṣūb</i> Verb cannot Follow <i>wa-</i>	191
6. What Induces the Verb Following <i>wa-</i> to be <i>manṣūb</i> ?	192
7. Conclusion	194
VIII <i>Ḥattā</i>	197
1. Introduction	197
2. The Morphological Pattern of <i>ḥattā</i> and the Possible Link to the Root <i>ḥtt</i>	199
3. The Mood of the Verb Following <i>ḥattā</i> : <i>naṣb</i> or <i>rafʿ</i>	201
4. Is There a Correlation between the Mood of the Verb Following <i>ḥattā</i> and the Time it Conveys?	220
5. The Theory that if <i>qalb</i> cannot be Performed, the Verb Following <i>ḥattā</i> must take <i>naṣb</i>	226
6. The Verb Following <i>ḥattā</i> can take <i>rafʿ</i> only when the First Action Leads to the Second	232
7. When the Main Verb is Negated or the Occurrence is Questioned, the Verb Following <i>ḥattā</i> must take <i>naṣb</i>	234
8. When <i>ḥattā</i> and the Following Verb are an Essential Part of the Sentence, the Verb must take <i>naṣb</i>	237
9. Is There an ' <i>an muḍmara</i> after <i>ḥattā</i> ?	238
10. The Separation between <i>ḥattā</i> and the Following Verb	242
11. The Action which the Verb Preceding <i>ḥattā</i> Denotes takes Place Gradually until the Occurrence of the Action Denoted by the Following Verb	243
12. Conclusion: An Attempt to Explain the Difference between <i>rafʿ</i> and <i>naṣb</i> following <i>ḥattā</i>	244
IX <i>Lī-</i>	249
1. Introduction	249
2. <i>Lām kay</i> ' <i>lī-</i> [with the meaning] of <i>kay</i> "in order to"'	250
3. <i>Lām al-juḥūd</i>	252
4. <i>Lām al-ʿāqiba/al-ṣayrūra</i>	256
5. <i>Lī-</i> in the Structure ' <i>urīdu lī(an) tafʿala</i> '	260
6. The Mood of the Verb Following the Four Kinds of <i>lī-</i> Discussed in the Preceding Sections	262
7. The Pronunciation of <i>lī-</i> with <i>fathā</i> (<i>la-</i>)	263

8. Is There an <i>'an muḍmara</i> after <i>li</i> -?	266
9. Can <i>'an</i> Appear after <i>li</i> -?	268
10. Conclusion	270
X Free <i>naṣb</i>	271
1. Introduction	271
2. Grammarians' Opinions on the Mood of Verbs Missing a Preceding <i>'an</i>	272
3. Conclusion	282
XI The Possible Interchangeability of <i>rafʿ</i> and <i>naṣb</i>	283
1. Introduction	283
2. Al-Astarābādī	284
3. Ibn Mālik	286
4. Abū Ḥayyān	287
5. Ibn Hišām	288
6. Al-Farrā'	288
7. The Opinion Attributed to the Kūfans, that <i>rafʿ</i> and <i>naṣb</i> following <i>fā</i> - May Possess the Same Meaning	290
Discussion and Conclusion	291
1. Introduction	291
2. The Differences in Approach between Early (Especially Sībawayhi and al-Farrā') and Later Grammarians	291
3. Dialectal Differences and Historical Developments Concerning the <i>naṣb</i> Mood	292
4. The Importance of the Speaker's Intention in the Determination of Moods in General and the <i>naṣb</i> Mood in Particular	295
5. A Note on Exceptional Examples	296
Appendix A Basic Technical Terms and Concepts	297
Appendix B Grammarians' Biographies	319
Bibliography	351
Indices	369
Index of Names	371
Index of Terms	376
Index of Qur'ānic Quotations	381

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is the result of a research project which began in 2002, when I chose the subjunctive mood following the particle *'idan* in Classical Arabic as the topic of my M.A. dissertation. After having completed this work, I decided to continue exploring this mood and devoted my Ph.D. dissertation to the subjunctive mood in Arabic grammatical thought. This book is a revised and abbreviated English version of the two above-mentioned dissertations. I would like, first of all, to thank Prof. Aryeh Levin, my M.A. and Ph.D. supervisor, for his efforts and the resources he contributed towards the successful completion of the two dissertations. I would also like to thank Prof. Simon Hopkins and the second anonymous reader of my Ph.D. dissertation for their helpful remarks and suggestions, which were taken into account in this book.

During my work on the manuscript I was fortunate to receive aid and guidance from several people. Prof. Yishai Peled was kind enough to give me helpful advice related to the book's structure and several specific points. Prof. Etan Kohlberg was of great assistance from the beginning of my work to its completion, having agreed to read parts of the manuscript and to share with me his ideas and suggestions.

To conclude, I would like to thank the following persons who contributed to the completion of the manuscript: Prof. Kees Versteegh, the editor, who showed his interest in this project from its beginning; Mrs. Jasmin Lange, the assistant editor, who constantly assisted me in preparing the manuscript; the anonymous reader of the manuscript, whose remarks, corrections and suggestions helped to improve the work, even if I disagreed with some of them; and Mr. Michael Guggenheimer, who meticulously read the whole manuscript and improved its form and style.

PREFACE

1. PRESENTATION OF THE TOPIC

This book's primary purpose is to define and characterize the opinions of medieval Arab grammarians concerning the *naṣb* mood in the verbal system of Classical Arabic. Special attention is given to the most prominent early grammarians Sibawayhi and al-Farrā' (see §§2.1.1.1–2.1.1.2), who represent the schools of Baṣra and Kūfa, respectively.

The three moods which an imperfect verb can take are *rafʿ*, *naṣb* and *jazm*. These are often translated into English as indicative, subjunctive and jussive, respectively.¹ The mood endings of the imperfect verb and the case endings of the noun form what is known as *ʾiṣrāb*; they stand in opposition to *bināʾ*, the fixed and stable endings of the particles, the perfect verb and some of the nouns.²

Generally speaking, the *naṣb* mood in Classical Arabic, like the subjunctive mood in other languages (the Romance languages, for example), is used to denote a hypothetical action or event whose occurrence is dependent on another, such as desire and fear.³ According to Arab grammarians, verbs take the *naṣb* mood when they are preceded by certain *ʾawāmil* 'factors' which affect and determine the form of the verb, under certain conditions. These *ʾawāmil* are either separate independent words followed by the verb, or particles which attach directly to the verb.

This book introduces and examines the linguistic situation in Classical Arabic, as it is described by early and later grammarians. In addition, it presents and analyzes the theories grammarians propose to explain the

¹ To these three moods one must add the intensifying form called 'energicus' or 'energetic' (e.g. *yafʿalan(na)* 'he will certainly do'), which differs syntactically and semantically from the above-mentioned three moods. For a survey on the moods in Arabic, see *EALL* III, 269b, s.v. Mood (Standard Arabic), especially §1. On *rafʿ*, *naṣb* and *jazm* see also appendix A, §11, §10 and §8, respectively.

² On *ʾiṣrāb*, *bināʾ* and the case and mood endings see *EF* III, 1248b–1250a, s.v. *ʾiṣrāb*.

³ In Ibn El Farouk, *Subjonctif*, the author unsuccessfully attempts to show that the translation 'subjunctive' does not fit the Arabic *al-muḍāriʿ al-manṣūb*. He ignores the shared syntactic and semantic characteristics of the notions of the 'subjunctive' and '*naṣb*' moods, as mentioned above. Cf. Sadan, *Subjonctif*, where the author points to similarities between the *naṣb* mood in Classical Arabic and the subjunctive mood in French, according to grammarians of these two languages.

different aspects of this complex subject, and the various examples on which they base their theories. The grammarians' examples are taken from the spoken language of the Bedouins, whose Arabic is considered reliable, the Qur'ān and ancient Arabic poetry. Several later grammarians, especially Ibn Mālik, quote Ḥadīth traditions, too, as evidence for their linguistic theories, but this method is not common.⁴

2. THE SOURCES

The book's primary sources consist of some 160 works by approximately 85 grammarians, lexicographers and commentators on the Qur'ān and ancient Arabic poetry. In addition, it also takes into account secondary sources, consisting of more than one hundred books, articles and dissertations relevant to the topic, from the pioneering works of the eighteenth century, published in Latin and other languages, to contemporary scholarly studies. In this chapter, as throughout the entire book, all references to primary and secondary sources are sorted according to the chronological order of the authors.

2.1. *Primary sources*

The most important primary sources are the grammarians' books, beginning with Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*. Classical Arabic lexicons, commentaries on the Qur'ān and commentaries on ancient Arabic poetry are the three other genres which belong to the primary sources. In view of the large number of primary sources, I decided to conclude the book with an appendix devoted to concise biographical and bibliographical information on the authors and the works used and quoted in this book (appendix B). This solution seems to me preferable to devoting a short note to each personality where it is first mentioned.

2.1.1. *Grammarians' works*

Until a few decades ago the number of edited and published grammarians' writings was quite limited, but during the second half of the twentieth century many early and later works have become available for scholars

⁴ See *EF* IX, 370b–372b, s.v. *SHawāhid*, §I and §II.3.

in printed and electronic editions.⁵ The research base of this book is thus considerably broader than that of former studies.

Below is a list of the most important grammarians whose works I consulted for this study.⁶ Next to each grammarian the year of death and the titles of his most relevant books are given. Before going into detail, three remarks are in order:

- a. Since Sībawayhi and al-Farrā' occupy a special place in this study, only their entries in the following list contain further details, whereas other grammarians' entries consist of no more than the year of death and their most prominent books.
- b. The following list contains only the more important of the grammarians whose works I used. The full list of grammarians whose works I consulted can be found in the above-mentioned appendix B, as well as in the bibliography.
- c. Whenever applicable, I note the commentaries used in conjunction with the associated book.

2.1.1.1. *Sībawayhi* (died ca. 180/796): al-Kitāb Sībawayhi is the most prominent representative of the Baṣran school. His *Kitāb* is the earliest known Arabic grammar, and the most important. To this day this masterpiece remains the primary source for any study of Arabic grammar. Since it is the basis and model for the subsequent grammatical literature, it naturally figured most prominently in my study. After a perusal of the relevant chapters in the *Kitāb*,⁷ I read their various commentaries,⁸ as well as the commentaries on the poetry quoted in them.⁹ I also used Troupeau's index of the *Kitāb* (Troupeau, *Lexique*), Jahn's pioneer translation of this

⁵ For examples of the latter see bibliography, note 1 on the digital collections by al-Turāt.

⁶ For two surveys of the main Arabic grammar scholars and works, see *EF* VII, 914, s.v. *Naḥw*, §4; Blanc, *Linguistics*.

⁷ I used mainly the Derenbourg edition (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb*), but also compared all the relevant chapters to the *Bulāq* edition (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb (Bulāq)*), in order to locate transmission differences which might be significant for understanding the text. Hārūn's edition, which was published in Cairo between 1966–1977, was rarely used, because it usually contains no significant additions to the two above-mentioned editions.

⁸ I used Abū Saʿīd al-Sirāfi's, al-Fārisi's, al-Rummāni's, al-Šantamarī's and Ibn Xarūf's commentaries.

⁹ I used al-Naḥḥās', Abū Muḥammad al-Sirāfi's and al-Šantamarī's commentaries.

masterpiece (Jahn, *Translation*) and modern studies devoted to various aspects of Sībawayhi's grammatical thought.¹⁰

2.1.1.2. *Al-Farrā'* (died 207/822): Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān Al-Farrā', a contemporary of Sībawayhi, is the most prominent representative of the Kūfan school. His *Ma'ānī*, which deals with grammatical problems found in Qur'ānic verses, is the main source from which his grammatical views can be inferred. A comparison of al-Farrā's and Sībawayhi's views, as expressed in the *Ma'ānī* and the *Kitāb*, respectively, sheds light on the differences between the two rival schools which they represent, the Kūfan and the Baṣran. I found Kinberg's comprehensive index of the *Ma'ānī* (Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*) very useful and also used modern studies devoted to specific points in al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī* in particular and Kūfan grammatical thought in general.¹¹

2.1.1.3. *Al-Axfaṣ* (died between 210–221/825–835): Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān

2.1.1.4. *Al-Mubarrad* (died ca. 285/898): al-Muqtaḍab

2.1.1.5. *Ṭa'lab* (died 291/904): Majālis Ṭa'lab

2.1.1.6. *Ibn al-Sarrāj* (died 316/928): al-Mūjaz, al-'Uṣūl

2.1.1.7. *Al-Zajjājī* (died ca. 337/948): Ḥurūf al-ma'ānī, al-Jumal,¹² al-Lāmāt

2.1.1.8. *Al-Sirāfi*, Abū Sa'īd (died 368/979): Šarḥ kitāb Sībawayhi¹³

2.1.1.9. *Al-Fārisī* (died 377/987): al-'Idāh,¹⁴ al-Ta'liq 'alā kitāb Sībawayhi¹³

2.1.1.10. *Al-Rummānī* (died 384/994): Ma'ānī l-ḥurūf, Manāzil al-ḥurūf

¹⁰ I refer mainly to Ba'albakī's, Carter's and Levin's studies.

¹¹ These are Beck, *'Idān*; al-Anṣārī, *al-Farrā'*; Dévényi, *al-Farrā'*; Dīrah, *Naḥw*; Kāzim, *Naḥw*.

¹² I used al-Baṭalyawsi's, Ibn 'Uṣfūr's, Ibn Abī Rabī's and Ibn Hišām's commentaries. I also used al-Baṭalyawsi's commentary on the poetry quoted in al-Zajjājī's *Jumal*.

¹³ Cf. note 8.

¹⁴ I used al-Jurjānī's, Ibn al-Ṭarāwa's and Ibn Abī Rabī's commentaries. I also used Ibn Barrī's commentary on the poetry quoted in al-Fārisī's *'Idāh*.

- 2.1.1.11. *Ibn Jinnī* (died 392/1002): al-Luma',¹⁵ Sirr šinā'at al-'i'rāb, al-Xaṣā'iṣ
- 2.1.1.12. *Al-Jurjānī* (died 471/1078): al-Jumal,¹⁶ al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-'iḍāḥ¹⁷
- 2.1.1.13. *Al-Zamaxšarī* (died 538/1144): al-Mufaṣṣal fī šun'at al-'i'rāb¹⁸
- 2.1.1.14. *Ibn al-Anbārī* (died 577/1181): al-'Inṣāf fī masā'il al-xilāf
- 2.1.1.15. *Ibn Ya'īs* (died 643/1245): Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal¹⁹
- 2.1.1.16. *Ibn al-Ḥāḡib* (died 646/1249): 'Amālī Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, al-Kāfiya,²⁰ Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal¹⁹
- 2.1.1.17. *Ibn Mālik* (died 672/1273): al-'Alfiyya,²¹ Šarḥ 'umdat al-ḥāfiẓ, Tashīl al-fawā'id²²
- 2.1.1.18. *Al-Astarābādī* (684/1285 or 686/1288): Šarḥ al-kāfiya²³
- 2.1.1.19. *Abū Ḥayyān* (died 745/1344): Irtiṣāf al-ḡarab
- 2.1.1.20. *Ibn Hišām* (died 761/1360): Muḡnī l-labīb²⁴
- 2.1.1.21. *Ibn 'Aqīl* (died 769/1367): al-Musā'id 'alā tashīl al-fawā'id,²⁵ Šarḥ al-'Alfiyya²⁶

¹⁵ I used al-Ḍarīr's, Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī's, al-Šarīf al-Kūfī's and Ibn al-Xabbāz's commentaries.

¹⁶ I used al-Jurjānī's own commentary, as well as Ibn al-Xaṣṣāb's and al-Xwārazmī's.

¹⁷ Cf. note 14.

¹⁸ I used al-Xwārazmī's, Ibn Ya'īs's, al-Saxāwī's and Ibn al-Ḥāḡib's commentaries. I also used al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī's commentary on the poetry quoted in al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal*.

¹⁹ Cf. note 18.

²⁰ I used al-Astarābādī's excellent commentary and also Šalāḥ al-Dīn's and al-Jāmī's. I also used al-Baḡdādī's *Xizāna*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in Ibn al-Ḥāḡib's *Kāfiya*.

²¹ I used Ibn al-Nāẓim's (i.e. Ibn Mālik's son), Abū Ḥayyān's, Ibn Hišām's, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya's, Ibn 'Aqīl's, al-Makkūdī's, al-Uṣmūnī's and al-Suyūṭī's commentaries. I also used al-'Aynī's commentary on the poetry quoted in Ibn al-Nāẓim's, al-Murādī's, Ibn Hišām's and Ibn 'Aqīl's *'Alfiyya* commentaries.

²² I used Ibn Mālik's own commentary, as well as Abū Ḥayyān's and Ibn 'Aqīl's.

²³ Cf. note 20.

²⁴ I used al-Suyūṭī's commentary on the poetry quoted in Ibn Hišām's *Muḡnī*.

²⁵ Cf. note 22.

²⁶ Cf. note 21.

2.1.1.22. *Al-Suyūṭī (died 911/1505):* al-ʿAšbāh wal-naẓāʾir, Hamʿ al-hawāmīʿ, al-ʾItqān

2.1.2. *Lexicons*

In addition to the grammarians' books, I also used Classical Arabic lexicons in which grammarians' statements and views are often quoted and sometimes explained.²⁷ These are al-Xalīl's *Kitāb al-ʿayn*, al-Aẓharī's *Tahdīb al-luġa*, Ibn Fāris' *Muġmal al-luġa*, al-Jawharī's *Tāj al-luġa*, Ibn Sida's *Muḥkam* and *Muxaṣṣaṣ*, al-Ḥimyarī's *Šams al-ʿulūm*, al-Šāġānī's *Takmila*, Ibn Manẓūr's *Lisān al-ʿarab*, al-Fayyūmī's *Miṣbāḥ*, al-Firūzābādī's *Qāmūs*, al-Kaffawī's *Kullīyyāt*, al-Zabīdī's *Tāj al-ʿarūs* and al-Bustānī's *Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ*.

2.1.3. *Commentaries on the Qurʾān*

To understand the Qurʾānic verses which grammarians and lexicographers quote and use in their grammatical discussions, I used various Qurʾānic commentaries. I focused on commentaries written by grammarians, which belong to the genre of *Maʾānī l-Qurʾān* that treats grammatical problems found in Qurʾānic verses.²⁸

2.1.4. *Commentaries on ancient Arabic poetry*

In their grammatical discussions, grammarians often exemplify their views with lines of poetry. To understand these I used the grammarians' commentaries on the poetry quoted in the following books:²⁹ Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see note 9), al-Zajjājī's *Jumal* (see note 12), al-Fārisī's *ʾIdāḥ* (see note 14), al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal* (see note 18), Ibn al-Ḥājjib's *Kāfiya* (see note 20), the commentaries on four of Ibn Mālik's *ʾAlfiyya* commentaries (see

²⁷ For an extensive survey of Classical Arabic lexicography, see *EF* IV, 524–525, s.v. *Qāmūs*, §1; *EALL* III, 30a, s.v. Lexicography: Classical Arabic. In addition to the lexicons mentioned in this section, I made extensive usage of Lane's indispensable lexicon (Lane, *Lexicon*).

²⁸ In some cases the grammarian's Qurʾānic commentary is the main (and sometimes only) book from which his grammatical views can be inferred. The most salient example is al-Farrāʾ, the most prominent representative of the Kūfan school (see §2.1.1.2); a further example is al-Aḫfaṣ (see §2.1.1.3). Additional grammarians' Qurʾānic commentaries which I used are al-Zajjājī's *Maʾānī l-Qurʾān waʾiʾrābuhu* and *ʾIrāb al-Qurʾān*, al-Naḥḥās' *ʾIrāb al-Qurʾān*, al-Fārisī's *ʾIġfāl*, Ibn Jinnī's *Muḥtasab* and Ibn al-Anbārī's *Bayān*. In addition, I used Muftī's study which is devoted to the Kūfan readings of Qurʾānic verses (Muftī, *Qurrāʾ*).

²⁹ For an extensive survey of this genre, see *EF* IX, 371b–372a, s.v. *ŠHawāhid*, §II.1.

note 21) and Ibn Hišām's *Muġnī* (see note 24). In addition, I used al-Fārisī's commentary on difficult lines of poetry (al-Fārisī, *Šarḥ al-'abyāt*), as well as Fischer and Bräunlich's and Ya'qūb's modern studies (Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid* and Ya'qūb, *Šawāhid*, respectively).

2.2. Secondary sources

The secondary sources are books, articles and dissertations which are relevant to the topic of this study.³⁰ These are quoted when they offer new information or an analysis which is not found in the grammarians' works; my aim throughout is to analyze the grammarians' views directly from their own works, so modern studies are mainly used secondarily.

3. CLASSIFICATION OF NAŠB ACCORDING TO PREVALENT OPINION AMONG GRAMMARIANS

According to Sibawayhi and most subsequent grammarians, the particles following which the imperfect verb takes *našb*, under certain conditions, are divided into two groups:³¹ (a) particles which function as *'awāmil* and directly induce the *našb* mood; (b) particles following which the verb is *manšūb* due to an *'an muḍmara*. The former includes *'an* 'that', *lan* 'not', *kay* 'in order that'³² and *'iḍan* 'then, therefore'; in the latter we find the conjunctions *'aw* 'unless', *fa-* 'with the result that' and *wa-* 'with the fact that', and also the prepositions *ḥattā* 'until/in order that' and *li-* 'in order that'. In addition, there is evidence for a few exceptional examples in which the imperfect verb takes *našb* without being preceded by any of the above-mentioned particles. The *našb* mood in these examples, which I call 'free *našb*', is usually explained as due to an *'an muḍmara*. Here is a schematic description of all the above-mentioned *našb* environments:

³⁰ I was able to locate some of these modern studies by using Fück, *Studien*; Bakalla, *Bibliography*; al-'Ānī-Parkinson, *Bibliography*.

³¹ For a general survey see *EP* VII, 974b–975a, s.v. *Našb*. Cf. Ibn El Farouk, *Subjonctif*, 124, §2°, where the author fails to mention *'aw* and *li-* as particles following which a *manšūb* verb can occur; Owens, *Foundations*, 318, §1.6.1, where even more relevant particles are omitted.

³² Sibawayhi, followed by most grammarians, does not posit an *'an muḍmara* after *kay*, which he conceives as the *'āmil* which affects the mood of the following verb. However, he says that some speakers consider *kay* a *ḥarf jarr* 'preposition', followed by an *'an muḍmara*. See chapter 3, §6.1 and §6.3.

The *naṣb* mood environments in Arabic*Naṣb* following a particle (1–9)*Naṣb* not following a particle (10)

- a. The particles which directly induce (10) Free *naṣb* the *naṣb* mood:
 - (1) *'an*; (2) *lan*; (3) *kay*; (4) *'iḍan*
- b. The particles following which the verb is *manṣūb* due to an *'an muḍmara*:
 - The conjunctions (5) *'aw*; (6) *fā*;
 - (7) *wa*–
 - The prepositions (8) *hattā*; (9) *li*–

In this study I aim at a careful analysis of all the ten above-mentioned syntactic environments in which it is possible to find a *manṣūb* verb. Each is examined in a separate chapter, due to their unique syntactic and semantic characteristics. In some chapters I deal with sentence types in which the associated particle is not followed by a *manṣūb* verb and confront them with similar sentence types where the verb takes *naṣb*; this comparison assists in understanding the syntactic and semantic contexts in which the *naṣb* mood is used.

4. THE BOOK'S STRUCTURE

This preface is followed by ten chapters devoted to the various contexts of the *naṣb* mood (the chapter order corresponds to the numbers 1–10 in the schematic description in §3 above). Most sections in each of these chapters are divided into three subsections, devoted to Sībawayhi's, al-Farrā's and other grammarians' views. In some cases an additional fourth subsection is devoted to a separate analysis of modern scholars' views on the associated issue, but these are more often included in the discussions of the grammarians' views (see §2.2 above). Every chapter ends with a concluding section which contains a concise description of its main ideas.

Chapter eleven is devoted to the interchangeability of *rafʿ* and *naṣb*, which is possible in some contexts according to several later grammarians. The book ends with a concluding chapter, followed by a bibliography and two appendices:

- a. Appendix A: Basic technical terms and concepts. This appendix contains definitions and discussions of the main technical terms and concepts which the grammarians use in their discussion of the *naṣb* mood. Throughout the book the reader is referred to the relevant sections in this appendix, which is sorted alphabetically.
- b. Appendix B: Grammarians' biographies. This appendix contains biographical details on all the grammarians, lexicographers and commentators on the Qur'ān and ancient Arabic poetry whose views are quoted and referred to in this work. In addition, it provides a concise bibliographical description of the works which I use and quote. The appendix is sorted alphabetically according to name and concludes with a key which is sorted chronologically according to the year of death.

5. TECHNICAL PRINCIPLES

5.1. *References to primary and secondary sources*

In most cases the reference to the relevant lines, and not only pages, is given. In references to both primary and secondary sources, large roman numbers are used to indicate volumes, en-dashes (–) are set between inclusive page and line numbers, and the minus sign (–) introduces a line number from the bottom of a given page. When necessary, the section number is given, preceded by the section sign (§).³³

5.2. *Transcription and vocalization*

As a rule, all Arabic excerpts are phonetically transcribed, with the exception of a few discussions related to orthography in which the Arabic script is used. The *lām* of the definite article is always given (before sun letters, too) and separated from the following word by a hyphen.³⁴ *Hamzas* are given throughout except when introducing a proper noun or a part thereof.³⁵ Complete sentences (as well as full or partial quotations from the Qur'ān and poetry) are fully vocalized, whereas terms are not.³⁴

³³ For example, the reference “Abū Hayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 120, –2–121, 3” stands for the five lines in Abū Hayyān's *Irtiṣāf*, fourth volume, from page 120, second line from the bottom until page 121, third line.

³⁴ For example, *ḍarūrat al-šī'r* ‘poetic license’ (and not *ḍarūratu š-šī'r*).

³⁵ For example, “Abū l-Ḥasan al-Axfāš” and not “Abū l-Ḥasan al-'Axfāš”.

5.3. *Qur'ānic verses*

As a rule, quotations from the Qur'ān are vocalized in accordance with the standard Egyptian text (which reproduces the reading of 'Āṣim in the recension of Ḥafṣ). Additional readings (*qirā'āt*) are indicated when they are relevant to the discussion. Qur'ānic verses are referred to by the word "Qur'ān" followed by the number of the sūra, a colon and the number of the verse.³⁶ Quotations from the Qur'ān are followed by a translation into English.³⁷

³⁶ For example, the reference "Qur'ān 2:12" stands for the 12th verse in sūra 2.

³⁷ For that purpose I used mainly Arberry's translation (Arberry, *Koran*).

CHAPTER ONE

'AN

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to 'an, the primary particle¹ that induces a following verb, under certain conditions, to take *našb*. It has been called 'an *al-xafīfa* 'the light 'an (i.e. with no *šadda*, in contrast to 'anna)',² 'an *al-nāšiba* 'an causing *našb*' and 'an *al-mašdariyya* 'an [which, together with the following verb, occupies the position] of a *mašdar*'. It should be noted that Arab grammarians mention other kinds of 'an (see below), but after this preface these will be treated in this chapter only in connection with 'an followed by a *maṣṣūb* verb.

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi discusses 'an in chapters 273–276 (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 424, 5–431, 14). At the end of chapter 273 Sībawayhi introduces the four kinds of 'an:

- a. 'An that causes the following verb, under certain conditions, to take *našb*. This is the 'an that is the subject of this chapter. Sībawayhi's views on it are introduced in §2.1.
- b. 'An in the sense of 'ay 'that is'. Its role is similar to a colon in the western punctuation system: it may introduce a direct quote, an elucidation or an explanation. It is referred to by later grammarians as 'an *al-mufasssira* 'the elucidating 'an'.

¹ Grammarians are all agreed that 'an is a *ḥarf* 'particle', not an *ism* 'noun'. Al-Fārisī says that the proof that 'an is a *ḥarf* and not an *ism* is its syntactic influence on the following verb: had it been an *ism*, it could not have influenced a verb, because according to the 'amal theory, a noun cannot be an 'amil of a verb. See al-Fārisī, *Ta'liq* IV, 249, –3–250, 1. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Bağdādīyyāt*, 271, –3–272, 2; al-Fārisī, *Iqfāl* I, 121, 6–7; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 126, 10–11; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 515, 7; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 1193, 20; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 232, 2–3; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* II, 991, 3–4; al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāḥ* (1998) II, 26, –4; 31, 5.

Only one grammarian considers 'an an *ism*. Al-Šan'ānī, *Tahdīb*, 240, 8–12, argues that among the 'awāmil causing the verb to take *našb*, 'an is the only one which is a noun, whereas all the rest are particles.

² For a discussion of the use of the root *xff* to indicate a form with no *šadda*, see Sadan, *Xiffa*, 60–61, especially notes 8 and 10.

- c. *'An al-muxaffafa* 'the ungeminated *'an* (i.e. with no *šadda*)', which occupies the same position in the sentence as *'anna*. This kind of *'an*, according to Sībawayhi, has no syntactic effect on the following imperfect verb (if indeed such a verb appears; a perfect verb or a noun may also occur). §3.1 is devoted to Sībawayhi's discussion of the different contexts of this kind of *'an* in contrast to the first kind, that is followed by a verb in *naṣb*.
- d. *'An laǧwan* '*an* with no syntactic role or semantic meaning'.³ Later grammarians refer to this kind of *'an* as *'an al-zā'ida* '*an* added [for emphasis]'

Sībawayhi devotes the next three chapters, 274–276, to the first three kinds of *'an* mentioned above; no chapter is devoted to the fourth kind.

While Sībawayhi discusses several contexts and usages in which *'an* can occur in other chapters, these are not treated in the present work, since they do not pertain to the question of the mood of the verb following this particle. One such case is *'an* following one of the *'af'āl al-muqāraba* 'the verbs [conveying the idea] of an action about to occur',⁴ such as the common structure *'asā 'an yaf'ala* 'he may do [something]' and the less common *kāda 'an yaf'ala* 'he almost did [something]' (*kāda* is usually used without a following *'an*, i.e. *kāda yaf'alu*). Another phenomenon which is not treated in this work is omission of the *hurūf al-jarr* 'prepositions' before *'an* (as well as before *'anna*).⁵

³ According to Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 301a, –3–2, *laǧw*, when applied to speech, has the meanings 'Nought; of no account; unprofitable'. Cf. Hava, *Dictionary*, 690b, where one of the meanings of this term is given as 'useless word'; Wright, *Grammar* II, 339, 5–6, where this term is explained as 'a superfluous word, which does not count in the construction'.

⁴ Only some of the verbs which belong to the *'af'āl al-muqāraba* actually denote *muqāraba*, i.e. an expected close occurrence of a certain action. The entire group consists of verbs that may be divided into three semantic categories:

- a. Verbs denoting *muqāraba*: *kāda*, *karaba* and *'awšaka*.
- b. Verbs denoting *raǧā'*, i.e. an expectation and wish that a certain action occur: *'asā*, *harā* and *ixlawlaqa*.
- c. Verbs denoting *'inšā'*, i.e. the onset of a certain action: *ja'ala*, *tafiqa*, *'axaḍa*, *'aliqa* and *'anša'a*.

For Sībawayhi's discussion of these verbs, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 364, 13ff. (chapter 236); 426, 10–428, 2 (last part of chapter 274). For a summary of the grammarians' views in this aspect, see al-Sāmarā'ī, *Ma'ānī* I, 268–284. For a detailed modern analysis of *'asā*, see Ullmann, *Asā*.

⁵ For Sībawayhi's discussion of this phenomenon, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 425, 1ff. See further Wright, *Grammar* II, 193, §70, note g. According to Fleisch, the omission of prepositions before *'an* occurs mainly in certain contexts, such as order and prohibition or after verbs denoting fear. See Fleisch, *Arabe*, 201–202, note b.

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' in his *Ma'ānī* refers to the first three kinds of 'an which Sībawayhi discusses, but does not mention the fourth kind.

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Like Sībawayhi, other grammarians also consider 'an the primary 'āmil of all 'awāmil that induce the following verb to take *naṣb*.⁶ Most of them enumerate and discuss the same four kinds of 'an as Sībawayhi.⁷ A few mention other meanings, in addition to the four kinds mentioned above. Al-Harawī, for example, presents seven kinds of 'an.⁸

2. 'AN AS A PARTICLE THAT INDUCES NAṢB IN THE FOLLOWING VERB, AND WITH IT OCCUPIES THE POSITION OF A MAṢḌAR

2.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi refers to this kind of 'an in several places in his *Kitāb*. The references are as follows:

- a. In chapter 233, devoted to the imperfect verbs, Sībawayhi mentions that the particles which induce the following verb to take *naṣb* are 'an, *kay* and *lan*.⁹ He thoroughly discusses only the etymology of the latter

⁶ See, for example, al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 78, 11–12, where the author introduces his discussion of the *naṣb* mood saying 'ammā 'ani l-xaṣṣatu fahiya 'ummu l-ḥurūfi fī ḥādā l-bābi wal-ḡālibatu 'alayhi wal-qawīyyatu fīhi 'as for 'an with no *šadda* [which affects the following verb to take *naṣb*], it is the primary particle in this chapter, the first and strongest in it'. Cf. Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 13, 4–5; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, 'Amālī II, 799–800 ('imlā' 109); Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 59, 10–11; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 88, 2–3.

⁷ See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* I, 48, 13–49, 13; II, 361–362; Ibn Sīda, *Muxaṣṣaṣ* XIV, 55, 5–8.

⁸ See al-Harawī, 'Azhīya, 59–74, where the author discusses the four kinds of 'an mentioned above extensively, but adds three more kinds, that allegedly occur in the Qur'ān and poetry. These are: 'an meaning *li'allā* 'in order that not' (ibid., 70, 2–71, 8), 'an meaning 'id 'because' (ibid., 71, 9–74, 4) and 'an meaning *lā* 'not' (ibid., 74, 5–10). In my opinion, however, these three additional kinds actually reflect usages of 'an *al-nāṣiba*. In the first two the preposition preceding 'an was omitted (see note 5 above); as for the third, exemplified by Qur'ān 3:73, the common opinion among grammarians and Qur'ān commentators is that the clause which 'an introduces is a kind of a parenthesis.

For other grammarians and lexicographers who mention additional kinds of 'an, some based on al-Harawī's view, see al-Baṭalyawṣī, *Iṣlāḥ*, 382–387; Ibn al-Šajārī, 'Amālī, 422–426; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1693, 6–11; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 215–227; al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 199, 9–18; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 144–149; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) 37a, –2ff.

⁹ There is actually a fourth particle that directly induces a following verb to take *naṣb*: 'idan, discussed in chapter 4.

(see chapter 2, §2.1), and provides just one example each for *'an* and *kay*. His example of the usage of *'an* is *'urīdu 'an taf'ala* 'I want you to do [something]'.¹⁰

- b. In chapter 273, in which the four kinds of *'an* are introduced, Sībawayhi defines the first as one in which *takūnu fihi 'an wamā ta'malu fihi minā l-'af'āli bimanzilati maṣādirihā 'an* and the verbs which it syntactically influences [to take *naṣb*] are equivalent in it (i.e. in this kind) to their verbal nouns (i.e. the verbal nouns of these verbs).¹¹ From this definition it is clear why later grammarians refer to this kind of *'an* as *'an al-maṣdariyya*. The examples Sībawayhi provides of *'an* in chapter 274 (see c. below) are explained as cases in which *'an* and the following verb occupy the position of a *maṣdar*.
- c. Chapter 274 of the *Kitāb* is where the main discussion of *'an* followed by a verb in *naṣb* takes place. The title of this chapter reveals the most important characteristic that Sībawayhi attributes to this *'an*: *hāḍā bābun min 'abwābi 'ani llatī takūnu wal-fi'la bimanzilati maṣdarin* 'this is one of the chapters [devoted to the kind of] *'an* which is, together with the [following] verb, equivalent to a verbal noun'. Sībawayhi demonstrates this principle by three examples:¹²
 1. *'An ta'tīyanī xayrun laka* 'for you to come to me is good for you'. This sentence, says Sībawayhi, is equivalent to the sentence *al-'ityānu xayrun laka* 'the arrival is good for you'.
 2. A Qur'ānic verse: *'an taṣūmū xayrun lakum* 'for you to fast is good for you' (Qur'ān 2:184).
 3. A line of poetry: *'innī ra'aytu minā l-makārimi ḥasbakum / 'an talbasū ḥurra l-tīyābi watašba'ū* 'I believe that among the honorable deeds it is enough for you to wear the best clothes and to be satiated'.¹³ Sībawayhi explains that an equivalent sentence with the same meaning would be *ra'aytu ḥasbakum lubsa l-tīyābi*.

Subsequently in the same chapter¹⁴ Sībawayhi notes the resemblance between *'an* and *'anna*, both of which form, together with the following

¹⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 361, 14–15.

¹¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 424, 5–6.

¹² These examples are discussed in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 424, 17–425, 1.

¹³ A verse in the *kāmil* meter, by 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān or his son Sa'īd. See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 424, 19 and al-Sīrāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 169, 1–7, respectively. According to Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 141a, 2, the poet is either Jarīr or 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān.

¹⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 425, 9ff.

utterance, a phrase that is equivalent to a verbal noun.¹⁵ Here are two of his examples: *i'tinī ba'da 'an yaqa'a l-'amru* 'come to me after the thing will have happened' and *'atānī ba'da 'an waqa'a l-'amru* 'he came to me after the thing had happened'. In both sentences, says Sibawayhi, *'an* and the following utterance can be substituted by a verbal noun, in this case *ba'da wuqū'i l-'amri* 'after the thing's happening'.

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Contrary to Sibawayhi, al-Farrā' does not equate *'an* and the following verb with a verbal noun. However, he does refer to the time that this verb indicates (see below).

2.2.1. *The time conveyed by the manṣūb verb following 'an*

According to al-Farrā', the *naṣb* mood of a verb following *'an* represents future time, whereas *raf'* represents present time. He expounds this view in his discussion of the contexts in which the verb following *'an* should take *raf'* or *naṣb* (see §3.2).

2.3. *Other grammarians*

Many early and later grammarians give this kind of *'an* the name *'an al-xafīfa*, i.e. *'an* with no *šadda*, and emphasize, with Sibawayhi, that the utterance it introduces with the following verb is equivalent to a *maṣdar*.¹⁶ Many also use the same Qur'ānic verse quoted by Sibawayhi in this context (Qur'ān 2:184) to show this equivalence.¹⁷ Other grammarians call it *'an al-nāṣiba lil-fi'l 'an* that induces the [following] verb to take *naṣb*.¹⁸

2.3.1. *The time conveyed by the manṣūb verb following 'an*

Most grammarians emphasize that the *manṣūb* verb following *'an* denotes an action in the future.¹⁹ Ibn al-Xabbāz and al-Saxāwī, who express this

¹⁵ Sibawayhi also treats this resemblance in chapter 261, which is devoted to *'inna* and *'anna*. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 410, 4–8. Cf. *ibid.* II, 336, 8–10.

¹⁶ See, for example, al-Aṣfaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 294, 1–3; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 194, –1; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 77, 2 last lines; 78, 4ff.

¹⁷ See, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) I, 237, 9–10; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 333, 2–3; 338, 7–9; al-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 45, –1–46, 1; 78, 3 last lines; al-Fārisī, *Baġdādiyyāt*, 271, 2–3; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 176, 7–9; al-Fārisī, *Iġfāl* I, 124, 3–5; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 132, 4–12; al-Warrāq, *Ilal*, 69, –3–2; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 71, –2–72, 3.

¹⁸ See, for example, al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 66, –1–67, 6; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 309, 3 last lines.

¹⁹ See, for example, al-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 78, 12–13; al-Fārisī, *Iġfāl* II, 99, –5–4; al-Warrāq, *Ilal*, 71, 11–13; al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 66, 10–67, 1; al-Santamarī, *Nukat* I, 692,

view, attribute this to the fact that the occurrence in such a construction is not certain, as for example in the case when *'an* follows a verb denoting a desire (see §3.3.2.3).²⁰

Al-Mubarrad says that the verb following *'an* may convey either a future or a past time. The future is conveyed when an imperfect verb follows *'an*, as in *yasurrunī 'an tadhaba ġadan* 'it makes me happy that you will go tomorrow', while the past is conveyed when it is a perfect verb, as in *yasurrunī 'an dahabta* 'it makes me happy that you went'.²¹

Contrary to this view of al-Mubarrad, al-Zajjājī notes that an imperfect verb following *'an* may convey past time.²² This he does as part of a discussion of whether it is possible to say *'urīdu 'an 'af'ala kaḏā wakaḏā* 'I want to do so-and-so', when the verb (*'af'ala*) denotes an action that has already occurred. The answer given is that it is not possible, unless it is a kind of a *ḥikāya*, i.e. either quoted direct speech or an imitation of a previous utterance, as, for example *nurīdu 'an namunna* 'we want to pardon' (Qur'ān 28:5). According to the context, it is clear that the verb denotes an action in the past. Therefore, the *taqdīr* structure of this verse is *wakāna min ḥukminā yawma'idīn 'an namunna* 'it was [part] of our judgment on that day to pardon' and the original verse should be understood as a *ḥikāya*, the *manṣūb* verb *namunna* denoting an action that had already taken place. Subsequently al-Zajjājī quotes another similar Qur'ānic verse (Qur'ān 19:15), with the same explanation.

2.3.2. Evidence for exceptional jazm or raf' following 'an al-xafīfa

Some grammarians mention that there are exceptional instances in which the verb following *'an al-xafīfa* is not *manṣūb*, as expected, but rather *majzūm* or *marfū'*. However, evidence for such constructions found in poetry is rejected as invalid by some, who consider such cases as manifestations of poetic license.

6–7; al-Ḥarīrī, *Durra*, 91, 3–4; al-Zamaxṣarī, *'Unmūdaj*, 112, 7–9; Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Asrār*, 129, 4–3; Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 248, 3–4; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufašṣal* IV, 65, 1–3; 126, 6–9; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 231, 7–10; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 472, 3 last lines.

²⁰ See Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 357, 4–3; 515, 7–9; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 185, 7ff.

²¹ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḏab* I, 48, 14–18; II, 6, 3–6; 30, 3–7; 361, 4–6; III, 5, 3–8. Cf. Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 341, 3–7; al-Zamaxṣarī, *Mufašṣal*, 149, 1–6; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 201, 9ff.

²² For this discussion, see al-Zajjājī, *Majālis*, 298–299 (*al-majlis al-136*). Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *'Ašbāh* (1942) III, 33–34 (referred to by the editor of al-Zajjājī's *Majālis*), where this discussion is mentioned as having taken place in Mecca between Yāsīn al-Zayyāt, who posed the question, and Abū Muḥammad Yaḥyā b. al-Mubārak al-Yazīdī, who answered him.

Ibn Mālik reports on the views of some early Kūfan grammarians on this issue. In al-Jawālīqī's writings he found a statement attributed to Salma, which al-Farrā' transmitted from his master al-Kisā'ī and the latter from al-Ru'āsī, according to which the eloquent speakers of the Bedouins (*fuṣaḥā' al-ʿarab*) put the verb following 'an *wa'axawātuhā* in *naṣb*, but others below them (i.e. inferior to them) put it in *rafʿ* and others further below—in *jazm*.²³ Ibn Mālik criticizes this opinion, attributed to the Kūfans (see §2.3.2.1 below), but the evidence he cites seems to be of great value.²⁴ In §§2.3.2.1–2.3.2.2 below I present cases of such exceptional occurrences of *jazm* and *rafʿ*, respectively.

2.3.2.1. *Evidence for an exceptional jazm following 'an al-xafifa and possible explanations* The grammarians cite three lines of poetry in which the verb following 'an is *majzūm*. In two cases there exist other versions of the relevant verbs, in which there is no evidence for such an exceptional use of *jazm*. As for the third case, some explain the *majzūm* verb there as poetic license. These are the three verses:

- a. 'Abat Quḍā'atu 'an ta'rif lakum nasaban / wabnā Nizārin fa'antum bayḍatu l-baladi '[the members of the tribe of] Quḍā'a refused to acknowledge your genealogy, while the two sons of Nizār and you are the best of the people'.²⁵ Ibn Šuqayr cites this verse as an exceptional example for *jazm* following 'an.²⁶ Other versions of this verse, however, do not present this exceptional phenomenon.²⁷

²³ The Arabic word denoting the difference among the three groups is *dūna*. Rabin also understands this word as denoting levels of hierarchy. See Rabin, *West-Arabian*, 187, 5–8 (part of §nn). For a detailed reference to Rabin's words in this aspect, see §2.4.1.2 below.

²⁴ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 13, 16–14, 1. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1642, –4–2 and al-Murādī, *Janā*, 226, 3 last lines, where most of Ibn Mālik's words appear without his name being explicitly mentioned. See further Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 65, 11–13 and al-Suyūṭī, *Ham* IV, 91, 9ff., where al-Ru'āsī is cited; Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 927, 6–8, where this view is attributed to some of the Kūfans.

²⁵ A verse in the *baṣīṭ* meter, by al-Rā'ī l-Numayrī. According to Lane, *Lexicon* I, 282c, the expression *bayḍat al-balad* means 'the egg which the ostrich abandons' and can be used as insult or praise. I believe that in this verse, the intention is the latter.

²⁶ See Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 184, 3 last lines.

²⁷ In the poet's *Dīwān* the verb is *tarḍā* (see Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 184, note 2), a form which represents both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* (in this context, the latter is the regular mood and thus more probable).

Ibn Jinnī has the version *lā ta'rif lakum* instead of 'an *ta'rif lakum* (See Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'is* (1990) II, 343, 5–6). His version is also problematic, because after *lā* the *rafʿ* mood is expected. Ibn Jinnī explains that in this case *fahuwa 'ashalu listiqāli l-qammati* 'it (i.e. this version) is easier [to pronounce compared to the regular version *lā ta'rifu*] because of

- b. *'Idā mā ḡadawnā qāla wildānu 'ahlinā / ta'ālāw 'ilā 'an ya'tinā l-ṣaydu naḥṭibi* 'when we arrive in the morning, the children of our people say: come until the game comes to us and we will gather wood for fire'.²⁸ Al-Fārisi attributes the version *'ilā 'an ya'tinā* to al-Farrā' and criticizes it in strong terms as a *xaṭa' fāḥiṣ* 'a rude mistake'. Al-Fārisi argues that the correct version is *'ilā 'an ya'tīyanā* (in *naṣb*).²⁹
- c. *'Alā ṭāla kitmānī Buṭaynata ḥājatan / mina l-ḥājji mā tadrī Buṭaynatu mā hiyā; 'uḥāḍiru 'an ta'lam bihā fataruddahā / fatatrukahā ṭiqlan 'alayya kamā hiyā* 'for a long time I have hidden a [certain] matter from Buṭayna, [and] Buṭayna does not know what it is. I fear that she knows it, rejects it and turns it into a burden upon me, as it is'.³⁰ Ibn Mālik says that the Kūfans explain the *jazm* of the verb *ta'lam* following *'an* as a general phenomenon. He criticizes this view and says it should be explained as poetic license.³¹

These three verses are not the only evidence that at least some Bedouins put the verb following *'an* in *jazm*. Abū Ḥayyān reports evidence by Abū 'Ubayda and al-Liḥyānī that this was the accepted usage in the dialect of the Banū Ṣabāḥ.³²

2.3.2.2. *Evidence for an exceptional raf' following 'an al-xafifa and possible explanations* The instances in which the verb following *'an* takes *raf'* instead of an expected *naṣb* are usually explained in two different ways. The first is that *'an* is like *mā*, in having no syntactic effect, and thus

the heaviness of the *ḍamma* [in terms of pronunciation]'. (For the idea that pronouncing a *ḍamma* is more difficult than pronouncing a *sukūn*, i.e. a non vocalized consonant, see Sadan, *Xiffa*, 66, §2.)

²⁸ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Imru' al-Qays. For the context of this verse and the verses preceding and following it, see al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣarḥ ṣawāhid* (1966) I, 91–93.

²⁹ See al-Fārisi, *Baṣriyyāt* I, 259 (*mas'ala* 12). Al-Irbili (see al-Irbili, *Jawāhir*, 192, 8–10) quotes this verse in a similar context, but attributes the use of *jazm* following *'an* to the dialect of the Banū Ḥanīfa. For other grammarians and lexicographers who also use this verse as an example, see al-Murādi, *Janā*, 226, –2–227, 2; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1979), 45, 10–12; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Iršād* II, 353, 5; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 65, 3 last lines; al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 199, 12–14; Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, *Ṣarḥ* II, 927, 5 last lines; al-Uṣmūnī, *Ṣarḥ* II, 190, 2–4; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) 36b, 10–12; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* I, 43b, 2–4.

³⁰ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Jamīl Buṭayna.

³¹ See Ibn Mālik, *Ṣarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 13, 16–14, 1. Cf. al-Murādi, *Janā*, 227, 3–5; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1979), 45, 10–46, 2; al-Uṣmūnī, *Ṣarḥ* II, 191, 1–4.

³² See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irṭiṣāf* IV, 1642, 2 last lines. It seems that the source for this claim is al-Ru'āsī, whose name is previously mentioned (see *ibid.*, 1642, –4). Cf. al-Murādi, *Janā*, 226, 5–7; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1979), 45, 10ff.; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 65, 3 last lines; al-Uṣmūnī, *Ṣarḥ* II, 190, 2ff.; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 91, –3–2.

is syntactically treated in the same way as the latter. The second is that ʿan is ʿan *al-muxaffafa*, conceived as occupying the position of ʿanna, and so has no syntactic effect on the following verb. Some grammarians use only one of these explanations while others mention both. In any case, ʿan followed by *rafʿ* is considered exceptional, and is associated only with certain dialects or speakers.

a. The explanation of *tašbih* ʿan *bimā* ‘comparing ʿan to *mā* [and thus syntactically treating the former in the same way as the latter]’
 Ṭaʿlab cites a famous line of poetry in which the verb following ʿan is unexpectedly *marfūʿ*, and says *hādihi luġatun tušabbahu bimā* ‘this (i.e. putting the verb in *rafʿ* instead of the expected *naṣb*) is dialectal usage. It (i.e. ʿan) is compared [by the speakers] to *mā* [which has no syntactic effect on the following verb]’.³³ The line of poetry he cites is the last of the following three: *yā šāḥibayya fadat naṣī nufūsakumā / waḥaytumā kuntumā lāqaytumā rašadā; ʿan taḥmilā ḥājatan lī xaffa maḥmaluhā / wataṣnaʿā nīʿmatan ʿindī bihā wayadā; ʿan taqraʿāni ʿalā ʿAsmāʿa wayḥakumā / minnī l-salāma waʿan lā tuxbirā ʿaḥadā* ‘my two friends, I wish that my soul will redeem your two souls and that wherever you shall be, you will meet the right way. [I ask you]³⁴ to carry for me something which is easy to carry and to do me by this a favor,³⁵ [this thing being]³⁶ that you give Asmāʿ my greeting and that you inform no one’.³⁷

Al-Sīrāfi provides the same explanation as Ṭaʿlab, *wabaʿdu l-ʿarabi rubbamā rafaʿu mā baʿda ʿan tašbihan bimā* ‘some of the Bedouins sometimes put what follows ʿan (i.e. the imperfect verb) in *rafʿ*, comparing [ʿan] with *mā*’. As examples he quotes the above-mentioned line of poetry and a Qurʾānic verse with a reading in which the verb following ʿan is in *rafʿ*: *wal-wālidātu yurḍīna ʿawlādahunna ḥawlayni kāmilaḥayni liman ʿarāda ʿan*

³³ See Ṭaʿlab, *Majālis* I, 322, 3 last lines. Cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* (1990) I, 391, 4–5.

³⁴ This translation is based on al-Sīrāfi’s explanation *wal-maʿnā fihi ʿasʿalukumā ʿan taḥmilā* ‘and the meaning in it (i.e. in the verse) is I ask you to carry’. See al-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 80, 9. Cf. al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* IV, 128, –4–3; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 1194, 15–16; al-Baġdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 440, –4–3.

³⁵ The word *yad* here is a synonym of *nīʿma* or *maʿrūf*, meaning ‘favor’. See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 3963a.

³⁶ This translation is based on al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī’s explanation *ḥājati ʿilaykumā ʿan taqraʿāni*. See al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ*, 609, 1–2. Cf. al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 381, 1–2; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1966) I, 100, –4.

³⁷ The author of this verse, in the *basīṭ* meter, is unknown despite the fact that it is often quoted by grammarians.

yutimmu l-raḍā'ata '[divorced] mothers will nurse their children two full years, if they wish to complete the [period of] nursing' (Qur'ān 2:233).³⁸

b. The explanation of *'an al-muxaffafa*

Ibn Jinnī attributes the explanation of *tašbih 'an bimā* (which Tā'lab first presents, introduced above) to the Kūfans, rejects it, and argues that the correct explanation is that *'an* followed by a verb in *raf'* is actually *'an al-muxaffafa*. He adds that although this usage is exceptional, since the separation expected and needed between this *'an al-muxaffafa* and the following verb (for this separation, see §3.1.1 and §3.3.1) does not exist, this explanation is far more reasonable than the Kūfans', which suffers from *bu'd* 'improbability'. The improbability, he explains, lies in the fact that *'an* and *mā* impose different times on the actions indicated by the verbs following each of them: whereas the imperfect verb following *'an* cannot convey an action in the present but only one in the future, the imperfect verb following *mā* does convey an action in the present (for example, *mā taqūmu ḥasanun* means *qiyāmuka lladī 'anta 'alayhi ḥasanun* 'your [situation of] standing, in which you [currently] are, is good'). It is thus wrong to compare *'an* to *mā* and to argue that the former behaves like the latter syntactically, since each occurs in contexts in which the other does not occur.³⁹

It is interesting to note that the explanation of *tašbih 'an bimā* in Ibn al-Anbārī's *'Inšāf* is said to derive from the Baṣrans,⁴⁰ whereas Ibn Jinnī explicitly attributes it to the Kūfans.

c. Grammarians who use both explanations

According to al-Astarābādī and al-Suyūṭī, instances in which *'an al-maṣdariyya* does not induce the following verb to take *naṣb* can be explained by one of the two above-mentioned explanations. The two grammarians do not express a preference for one over the other.⁴¹

³⁸ See al-Sirāfī, *Šarḥ (Cairo)* I, 80, 3–9. Cf. al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 147, 14–17; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 194, 10–20; Ibn al-Ḥālib, *Šarḥ* II, 233, –4–234, 3.

³⁹ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* II, 549, 1–13. Cf. Ibn Sida, *Muḥkam* X, 476, –5–477, 7; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 918, 18–21; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Ḍarā'ir*, 163, 5–165, 5.

⁴⁰ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inšāf*, 232, 8–18. Later grammarians such as Ibn Mālik and Abū Ḥayyān also attribute the explanation of *tašbih 'an bimā* to the Baṣrans, and the explanation of *'an al-muxaffafa* to the Kūfans. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* I.2, 44, 12–45, 3; II.2, 10, –3–11, 13; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1642, 1–6; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 220, 5–11; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1979), 46, 3–7; Ibn Hišām, *Taxlīṣ*, 389, 1–7; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* II, 193, 4–9; al-Azharī, *Taṣriḥ* II, 362, 17–363, 7.

⁴¹ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 32, 4 last lines; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 91, 6–8.

d. Instances of defective verbs put in *rafʿ* instead of the expected *naṣb* as poetic license

Ibn Jinnī reports that in poetry it often happens that a *wāw* or *yāʾ* ending a word lose the expected *fathā* that indicates *naṣb* (mood or case), and that this can be explained as poetic license. He provides three examples of such verses, one of which is *famā sawwadatnī ʿĀmirun ʿan warāṭatin / ʿabā llāhu ʿan ʿasmū biʿummin walā ʿabi* '[the tribe of] ʿĀmir did not make me a head [of a tribe] due to heredity, God refused that I be noble due to a mother or a father'.⁴² In this verse the expected form of the verb following *ʿan* is *ʿasmuwa* (in *naṣb*) and not *ʿasmū* (in *rafʿ*).⁴³ Ibn Jinnī says that this happens less frequently with *wāw* than with *yāʾ*.⁴⁴

2.4. Secondary sources

2.4.1. Evidence for an exceptional jazm or rafʿ following ʿan al-xafifa and possible explanations

Modern research notes that in poetry and the Qurʾān there are some exceptional examples of a verb in *jazm* or *rafʿ* following *ʿan*, instead of the expected *naṣb*.⁴⁵ Two main explanations have been given for this: (1) a historical development in the usage of *ʿan*; (2) dialectal variety.

2.4.1.1. Conceiving the exceptional jazm and rafʿ as related to the historical development of the usage of ʿan

a. Fleischer's analysis

Fleischer dedicates a long discussion to the usage of *ʿan* in comparison with *ʿanna* in Old Arabic, and the mood of the verb following *ʿan*.⁴⁶ He

⁴² A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufayl. For the context of this verse and some explanations of the words, see al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1966) II, 953–954; al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 242–247.

⁴³ See Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* (1990) II, 344, 1–7; 294, 1–3. Cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Muḥtasab* I, 125, –3–126, 2. For other grammarians who express a similar opinion, see al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 184, 5–6; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 353, 1–5; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 20, 1–2; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* V, 2406, 1–2; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* I, 80, –3–81, 3.

⁴⁴ See Ibn Jinnī, *Munṣif* II, 115, 6–9.

⁴⁵ See, for example, Freytag, *Lexicon* I, 61a, –11–5; Wright, *Grammar* II, 27, §15, note b.; Howell, *Grammar* II, 592–594, §572; Lane, *Lexicon* I, 104b–104c; Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 70, –2–71, 4 (beginning of §58).

⁴⁶ For the whole discussion, see Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 525–532. The discussion's starting point is Fleischer's criticism of de Sacy's view on structures in which *ʿan* and a perfect verb follow a verb conveying an order or a decision, as in the example *ʿamara ʿan faʿala*. According to de Sacy (de Sacy, *Grammaire* II, 21, note 2), this usage is *abusiv* ('improper'), an imitation of a corresponding structure in Persian, and requires a *taqdīr* structure *ʿamara biʿan yafʿala fafaʿala* 'he ordered that [something] be done, and it was done'. Fleischer states (Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 525–526; II.1, 356) that de Sacy is mistaken,

argues that the dialectal usage of *'an* with a *marfū'* verb is to be explained by the historical development in the usage of *'an* and *'anna*.⁴⁷ Despite the basic rule of the grammarians that *'an* follows verbs conveying hope, order, etc., whereas *'anna* is used after verbs conveying solid knowledge (see §3.3.2 and especially notes 99–100 there), Fleischer cites many examples in which verbs of desire, hope, etc., such as *tamannā* 'to hope', *'amara* 'to order' and *'arāda* 'to want' are followed by *'anna* instead of the expected *'an*.⁴⁸ According to these examples and others in which *'an* and *'anna* occur in the exact same contexts, it is inferred that the syntactic status of *'an* followed by a verb in *naṣb* became identified with that of *'anna* followed by a noun in *naṣb*.⁴⁹ The next phase was the usage of *'an* in the sense of *'anna* with a following verb in *raf'* and in contexts in which the latter was used (this *'an* was referred to by the grammarians as *'an al-muxaffafa*). Afterwards, the usage of *'an* with a following *marfū'* verb expanded even more to contexts in which *'an* was formerly used with a verb in *naṣb*, such as Qur'ān 2:233 with the reading of the verb following *'an* with *raf'* (... *liman 'arāda 'an yutimmu l-raḍā'ata*) and the line of poetry containing the utterance *'an taqra'āni* (both examples are discussed in detail in §2.3.2.2).⁵⁰

b. Fischer's analysis

In his concise and clear article dedicated to the usages of *'an* and *'anna* (Fischer, *'An*), Fischer does not refer to Fleischer's theory introduced

that the structure *'amara 'an fa'ala* is common in Arabic and represents conceiving the object of the main verb (in the above example: the verb *'amara*) as a true fact and not as a desired idea. In order to convey the latter, the appropriate structure is *'amara 'an yaf'ala*. Cf. Wright, *Grammar* II, 25, –7––2 and Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 739, 6–17 (part of §242), who both refer to Fleischer's view.

⁴⁷ Fleischer refers to this theory in another place in his book: Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 512, –3ff.

⁴⁸ Cf. Gaudefroy-Demombynes-Blachère, *Grammaire*, 433, §425.c and 438–440, §§434–435, where the authors indicate the basic rule introduced above for the distinction in usage between *'an* and *'anna*, but add that it seems that this distinction was not absolute.

⁴⁹ For the most striking example, see Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 527, –2ff. Cf. Wright, *Grammar* II, 25, –2ff.; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 739, 18–740, 2, where the author argues, *contra* Fleischer, that the usage of *'anna* followed by a noun in *naṣb* in contexts in which *'an* was expected is not common.

⁵⁰ Fleischer also describes (Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 529, –1ff.) the next phase, which does not concern *'an* but *'anna*: after *'an* had begun to be used both with a *marfū'* as well with a *mansūb* verb, the language went one step further and replaced the verbal predicate of the sentence introduced by *'anna*, that expressed a movement, with a nominal predicate expressing non-movement, as in the following sentence by al-Mutanabbī: *īstahat 'annahā qabrūn* 'she wished she [would be] a grave'.

above, but he seems to be guided by the same one as Fleischer, namely that when examining the usages of 'an one has to take into account the historical developments which the syntactic roles of 'an and 'anna underwent. Fischer begins by arguing that 'in and 'inna, exactly like *lākin* and *lākinna*, are actually variants of the same morpheme, whose allomorphs were only secondarily given different functions.⁵¹ With this in mind, he adds, it is possible to examine the parallel process of the historical development which occurred in Arabic in the aspect of 'an and 'anna. The goal of his article is thus to show the nature of this historical development. His main ideas and theories are as follows. According to example sentences in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* in which the mood of the verb following 'an can be *jazm*, *naṣb* or *rafʿ*,⁵² and also in light of pre-classical texts, Fischer concludes that usages of 'an in pre-classical Arabic were not constrained by formal limitations.⁵³ Fischer then cites numerous examples from the Qurʾān in order to demonstrate the variety of contexts in which 'an is used: followed by an imperfect verb in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, an imperative verb, a perfect verb or a particle.⁵⁴ From these examples Fischer infers that in pre-classical Arabic 'an was not a particle which required the *naṣb* mood,⁵⁵ but rather that this latter gave the sentence its final meaning. Whereas 'an has no syntactic affect on the structure of the following sentence, 'anna is always attached to an explicit noun or an attached pronoun and requires that they be put in *naṣb*. In addition, 'anna points to this noun (or attached pronoun) and emphasizes it, just as 'inna does. Therefore, at the functional level the opposition between 'anna and 'an corresponds to the opposition between emphasis and non-emphasis, respectively. According to Fischer, emphasis by 'anna was connected to conceiving the idea expressed in the following sentence as a real fact, and therefore most grammarians argue that herein lies the difference between the usage of 'an and that of 'anna (see §3.3.2 and especially notes 99–100 there). Fischer argues that since the second half of the eighth century the *naṣb* mood no longer had the independent

⁵¹ See Fischer, 'An, 24, second paragraph. Cf. Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 353–366 (§128 is devoted to 'inna and 'anna and §129 deals with *lākinna*) and especially the beginning of §128.

⁵² These are sentences beginning with *katabtu 'ilayhi 'an* 'I wrote to him [saying] that' (see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 430, 5–8), which are thoroughly discussed in §3.1.2.5.

⁵³ For Fischer's approach to pre-classical Arabic, see Fischer, *Perioden*.

⁵⁴ For these examples, see Fischer, 'An, 27 (in note 12 there Fischer clarifies that only examples from the Qurʾān have been taken into account, because examples from poetry might have been affected by the meter, but even these reflect the same linguistic reality).

⁵⁵ Reckendorf seems to hold this opinion, too. See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 731, 6–9 (end of §237).

function of shaping the final meaning of the sentence (which it used to have in pre-classical Arabic), but became formally dependent on subordinating particles, including *'an*. The original opposition between *'anna* and *'an*, emphasis and non-emphasis, respectively, was replaced with an opposition between the perception of an action as realized or hypothetical, non-realized. Another way of looking at this change, according to Fischer, is that the decision whether to use *'anna* or *'an* changed from depending on the following sentence to depending on the preceding, main sentence. Whereas in pre-classical Arabic the decision to use *'anna* or *'an* depended on the speaker's desire to emphasize or not to emphasize the following clause, in Classical Arabic it became dependent on the semantic structure of the main sentence, i.e. on whether the speaker conceived it as expressing a real fact or an unrealized action, respectively.

2.4.1.2. *Exceptional jazm and raf' as a dialectal phenomenon*

a. Rabin's analysis

Rabin first discusses instances of “free *naṣb*”, in which an expected *'an* does not occur in the sentence and the relevant verb which should have followed it takes *raf'*, and characterizes them as typical to the dialect of Ḥijāz (see chapter 10, §2.4.1). He then moves to some unexpected instances in which a *marfū'* verb follows *'an*,⁵⁶ exemplified by Qur'ān 2:233 mentioned above, and a line of poetry quoted by al-Farrā' and later grammarians (the second of the following two): *'idā mittu⁵⁷ fadfinnī 'ilā janbi karmatin / turawwī 'izāmī ba'da mawtī 'urūquhā; walā tadfinannī fī l-falāti fa'innanī / 'axāfu 'idā mā mittu⁵⁷ 'an lā 'adūquhā* ‘when I die I will not taste it (i.e. the wine produced from the grape vine)’.⁵⁸ According to Rabin, this construction was not typical to the dialect of Ḥijāz, but rather used by some people there, who habitually omitted *'an* and put the verb which would have followed it in *raf'*; since they were unfamiliar with the usage of *'an*, they sometimes followed it with a *marfū'* verb. With respect to the above-mentioned Qur'ānic verse, Rabin assumes that there were two readings: *'arāda yutimmu* and *'arāda 'an yutimma*. Rabin quotes

⁵⁶ See Rabin, *West-Arabian*, 186–187, §nn.

⁵⁷ The more common form of the verb is *muttu* (see Lane, *Lexicon* VII, 2741a, 6ff.), but the two verses are cited with the version *mittu*.

⁵⁸ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Abū Mihjan al-Ṭaqafī. For the context of this verse, see al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣarḥ ṣawāhid* (1966) I, 101–103.

statements attributed to al-Ru'āsī and al-Lihyānī on putting the verb following 'an in *jazm* (these are discussed in §2.3.2 and §2.3.2.1) and also briefly refers to evidence that the verb following *lan* may be put in *jazm* (see chapter 2, §3.4).⁵⁹ Rabin assumes that putting the verb following 'an in *jazm* (as in verses b–c discussed in §2.3.2.1), was more common in the center and eastern parts of Arabia. He argues that these dialects may have had no *manṣūb* forms at all, and that therefore the *jazm* mood was used in subordinate clauses, as in Ethiopic.

b. Fleisch's analysis

Fleisch, like Rabin, also explains instances of verbs in an unexpected mood following 'an as a dialectal issue.⁶⁰ He repeats the view of the grammarians on the semantic contexts in which 'an and 'anna are used (uncertain and certain actions, respectively), and notes that this distinction is subject to many exceptions (cf. Fleischer's opinion discussed in §2.4.1.1 and note 48 there). He then mentions the theory of 'an *al-muxaffafa*, according to which a verb in *raf'* may follow 'an as long as there is a separation between them (see §3 and especially §3.1.1 and §3.3.1). However, some grammarians, Ibn Mālik for example, state that a separation is not compulsory but only preferable (see §3.3.1.2), and indeed, there are instances of 'an followed directly by a *marfū'* verb, with no separation between the two. In addition, Fleisch mentions instances of "free *naṣb*", which Rabin also mentions in this context (see the beginning of the previous section). All these instances lead Fleisch to the conclusion that the form *yaf'ala* of the imperfect verb was an innovation in Western Semitic. In his opinion, there was a time in which (some) speakers of Arabic used the form *yaf'alu* in indicative as well as in subjunctive contexts, and these speakers continued using this one form only. At that time, Fleisch hypothesizes, the form *yaf'ala* of the imperfect verb began to spread and eventually came to be considered the only possible form in contexts of the subjunctive, but there were still remains of the previous linguistic system of the speakers who used the form *yaf'alu* exclusively. These remains are the above-mentioned instances, in which one finds 'an *yaf'alu* (instead of *yaf'ala*). Fleisch thus argues that there is no basis for the theory of 'an *al-muxaffafa* and considers the instances of "free *naṣb*" in which 'an is omitted and the verb is

⁵⁹ Cf. Lipiński, *Grammar*, 358, §39.17, where the author briefly associates 'an with *lan* in this aspect, but unlike Rabin, does not base himself on any example.

⁶⁰ For the whole discussion, see Fleisch, *Arabe*, 198–200.

marfūʿ as further evidence for his theory of speakers who used the form *yafʿalu* exclusively.

As Fleisch mentions in his book,⁶¹ the above-mentioned theory and his conclusion with respect to the dialectal differences concerning the usage of *ʿan*, are the result of an extensive study on the form *yafʿala*, focusing on the usage of *ʿan* followed by an imperfect verb.⁶² Fleisch examined the form *yafʿala* (or, in his formulation, *yaqtula*) in the Semitic languages, the evidence in Arabic for a subjunctive form *yafʿalu* (or, in his formulation, *yaqtulu*), the views of Arab grammarians on these examples, and their theories in this aspect. At the end of the article he suggests the conclusion detailed above. Fleisch cites examples from poetry in which the form *yafʿalu* occurs instead of the expected *yafʿala*, and Qurʾān 2:233 mentioned above (some of the poetry was also cited above). As he correctly says, the grammarians do not reject these examples but rather explain them with the theory of *ʿan al-muxaffafa* and the contexts in which it appears (these contexts stand in contradiction to those of *ʿan* causing the following verb to take *naṣb*; for this issue see §3). However, Fleisch notes, this theory does not explain all the above-mentioned examples; he argues instead that the form *yafʿalu* was used in contexts of the subjunctive too, at least until the second century AH, and that this usage was dialectal. The examples in which the form *yafʿalu* occurs instead of the expected *yafʿala* form should therefore be understood as remains of the old system, in which only the form *yafʿalu* existed, and which was replaced by the newer system comprising the two forms *yafʿalu*: *yafʿala* for indicative and subjunctive contexts, respectively.

3. THE SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC CONTEXTS OF *ʿAN AL-MUXAFFAFA* COMPARED TO *ʿAN AL-MAṢḌARIYYA*

Grammarians in their discussions of the different kinds of *ʿan* pay considerable attention to the syntactic and semantic contexts of *ʿan* followed by an imperfect verb, and to the question of when *ʿan* is to be conceived as *ʿan al-muxaffafa*, i.e. *ʿan* meaning *ʿannahu* that does not affect the following imperfect verb, and when as *ʿan al-maṣḍariyya*, i.e. *ʿan* which causes the following imperfect verb to take *naṣb*. According to Sibawayhi and most later grammarians, the syntactic context required for conceiving *ʿan*

⁶¹ See Fleisch, *Arabe*, 200, 14–16.

⁶² For this study, see Fleisch, *Yaqtula*.

as *'an al-muxaffafa* is that it be separated from the following imperfect verb by a certain particle. As for the semantic context of *'an al-muxaffafa* compared to *'an al-maṣḍariyya*, most grammarians argue that *'an al-muxaffafa* is used after verbs conveying certain knowledge, whereas *'an al-maṣḍariyya* is used after verbs conveying lack of certain knowledge, fear or desire.

3.1. *Sibawayhi*

In chapter 273 *Sibawayhi* introduces the four kinds of *'an* (see §1.1), and defines the third kind as *bimanzilati 'annahu muxaffafatan maḥdūfatan* 'equivalent to *'annahu*, [occurring] with no *šadda* and [with the attached pronoun *-hu*] omitted'.⁶³ By this he means that *'an* of this kind conveys the same meaning as *'annahu*, but unlike the latter, it is *muxaffafatan* 'with no *šadda*'⁶⁴ and *maḥdūfatan* 'with omission' of the attached pronoun *-hu* of *'annahu*.⁶⁵ From this definition it is clear why later grammarians refer to this kind of *'an* as *'an al-muxaffafa*. *Sibawayhi* explains the examples of this kind of *'an*, introduced in chapters 275–276, as being equivalent to *'annahu*. These examples also demonstrate the syntactic and semantic contexts in which this kind of *'an* is used, in contrast to the cases in which *'an* induces the following verb to take *naṣb*. It is important to notice that the conception of *'an* as a shortened form of *'annahu* is the ground for the claim that it has no syntactic influence on the following verb: since this kind of *'an* has the meaning of *'annahu*, which has no syntactic effect on the following verb, it also has no such effect.

3.1.1. *The syntactic contexts of 'an al-muxaffafa compared to 'an al-maṣḍariyya*

Sibawayhi's view is that *'an* in the sense of *'annahu* cannot be used in all syntactic contexts. At the end of chapter 275 he argues that such *'an* can occur before a *marfū'* verb only when the two are separated by one of the following particles: *lā*, *sawfa*, *sa-* or *qad*. This requirement he considers proof that each of these four particles is a kind of a *'iwaḍ* 'compensation' for what has been omitted from *'annahu* (which occurs in

⁶³ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 424, 6–7 = *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb (Būlāq)* I, 475, 4–5. The passage quoted above is the shorter version, found in the *Būlāq* edition. This seems to be the correct version, a view also held by Jahn. See Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 124, note 2 of chapter 273.

⁶⁴ For this meaning, see note 2 above.

⁶⁵ Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 221, –15–13.

the *taqdīr* structure), thus creating *'an* (which occurs in the pronounced literal utterance).⁶⁶ As for *'an* in the sense of *'annahu* used to express a *du'ā'*, which is not separated from the following verb, see §3.1.2.4.

3.1.2. *The semantic contexts of 'an al-muxaffafa compared to 'an al-maṣdariyya*

3.1.2.1. *The usage of 'an following verbs denoting certain knowledge*

According to Sībawayhi, there are several different usages of *'an* following verbs denoting certain knowledge. If *'an* precedes an imperfect verb in such a context, it will usually induce *raf'*, and be explained as having the sense of *'annahu* (see a. below). On the other hand, if the verb denoting certain knowledge is negated, the verb following *'an* will be *manṣūb* (see b. below). In two very different structures, namely when *'an* is followed by a nominal sentence or a conditional one (see c. and d. below, respectively), it is also conceived as occurring in the sense of *'annahu*.

a. *'An al-muxaffafa* followed by *raf'*

Here are the five examples which Sībawayhi provides at the beginning of chapter 276 for *'an* occurring in the sense of *'annahu*.⁶⁷

1. *Qad 'alimtu 'an lā yaqūlu dāka* 'I knew that he would not say that'. The *taqdīr* structure in the speaker's mind, according to Sībawayhi, is [*qad 'alimtu*] *'annahu lā yaqūlu [dāka]*.
2. *Qad tayaqqantu 'an lā taf'alu dāka* 'I knew for sure that you would not do that'. The *taqdīr* structure here is similar to the one in the previous sentence: [*qad tayaqqantu*] *'annaka lā taf'alu [dāka]*.
3. The Qur'ānic verse *'afalā yarawna 'allā yarji'u 'ilayhim qawlan* 'do they not know that he will not respond to them at all?' (Qur'ān 20:89).
4. The Qur'ānic verse *li'allā ya'lama 'ahlu l-kitābi 'allā yaqdirūna 'alā šay'in min faḍli llāhi* 'so the people of the book know that they do not have a right of possession over the grace of God' (Qur'ān 57:29).
5. The Qur'ānic verse *'alima 'an sayakūnu minkum marḍā* 'he knew that there would be sick people among you' (Qur'ān 73:20).

⁶⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 429, 18–21 (end of chapter 275); 430, 21–431, 2 (middle of chapter 276). Cf. al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* I, 484, 5–11, where the author explains this issue, based on *ṣāhib al-Kitāb* 'the author (literally: owner) of the *Kitāb*', i.e. Sībawayhi.

⁶⁷ These five examples are discussed in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 430, 1–5.

In these five examples the main verb in the sentence followed by *'an* denotes certain knowledge: *'alima*, *tayaqqana* and *ra'ā*.⁶⁸ Sibawayhi explains that *'an* does not induce the following verb to take *naṣb* in these examples because their context is *mawḍi' yaqīn wa'tjāb* 'a [syntactic] place of certain knowledge and affirmation'. It can be thus inferred that *'an* which induces the following verb to take *naṣb* occurs after verbs which do not denote 'certain knowledge and affirmation', whereas *'an* in the sense of *'annahu* does occur after verbs that possess such denotations.

To these five examples one can add three more with verbs denoting certain knowledge, about which Sibawayhi argues that they are only theoretical and do not exist in the language. The first is discussed at the end of chapter 275: **'arāftu 'an taqūlu dāka* 'I knew that you would say that', and the other two are mentioned in chapter 276, after a discussion of verbs denoting doubt, and those denoting fear and desire (§3.1.2.2 and §3.1.2.3, respectively): **qad 'alimtu 'an taf'alu dāka* 'I knew that you would do that' and **qad 'alimtu 'an fa'ala dāka* 'I knew that he had done that'.⁶⁹ The reason that these examples are only theoretical and impermissible in the language is that the verb directly follows *'an*, with no separation by any of the four particles which Sibawayhi mentions (see §3.1.1).

b. *'An* followed by *naṣb* after verbs denoting certain knowledge in the context of double negation (using both a negative particle and *'illā*)
Towards the end of chapter 276 Sibawayhi discusses examples in which a main verb denoting certain knowledge is negated twice, by a negative particle and by *'illā*. The examples are *mā 'alimtu 'illā 'an taqūma* 'I did not know other than that you would stand' and *mā 'alamu 'illā 'an ta'tiyahu* 'I do not know other than that you will come to him'.⁷⁰ Sibawayhi states that *'an* followed by a *manṣūb* verb is possible after a verb denoting certain knowledge when the speaker does not say that he knows that a certain action will undoubtedly take place in reality, but rather expresses an *'išāra* 'hint or indication',⁷¹ as in the example *'arā mina l-ra'yi 'an taqūma*

⁶⁸ The verb *ra'ā* may denote certain knowledge or doubt. The commonly held opinion on Qur'an 20:89 cited above is that *ra'ā* there denotes certain knowledge; Sibawayhi explicitly says this with respect to all five examples cited above, including this verse. Later in chapter 275 (Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 430, 8–9), he includes *ra'ā* in the category of verbs denoting doubt; for the usage of *'an* following these verbs, see §3.1.2.2.

⁶⁹ For references, see note 66 above.

⁷⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 431, 6–10. Cf. Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 740, –1–741, 3 (§242, end of note 4), where the author refers to the first example and explains it.

⁷¹ Al-Sirāfi explains Sibawayhi's usage of the term *'išāra* as *maṣwara* 'advice'. See Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 129, note 11 of chapter 276.

'I think, from [the verb with the meaning of the verbal noun] *ra'y* 'holding an opinion', that you will stand'. In this example, too, the speaker does not state that an action of standing has occurred or will occur in reality. Sībawayhi concludes that had the speaker meant otherwise, he would have said *mā 'alimtu 'illā 'an sayaqūmūna* 'I did not know other than that they will stand'. In other words, he believes that using a *marfū'* verb after *'an* is possible when *'an* and the verb are separated (in this sentence, by the particle *sa-*) and when the utterance *mā 'alimtu 'illā* expresses the speaker's certain knowledge of an action which has occurred or will occur in reality.

c. *'An al-muxaffafa* before nominal sentences

At the end of chapter 276 Sībawayhi discusses sentences in which *'an* is followed by a nominal sentence, as in *'alimtu 'an 'Amrun dāhibun* 'I knew that 'Amr was going away'.⁷² Sībawayhi explains that the same sentence with the same meaning could be formed with *'anna*, i.e. *'alimtu 'anna 'Amran dāhibun*. However, when a verb in *raf'* directly follows *'an* the sentence cannot be formed with *'anna*. This is the reason for the separation between *'an* and the following *marfū'* verb (see §3.1.1): the speaker did not want both to shorten *'annahu* (to *'an*) and to have a *marfū'* verb directly after it (such a verb being impermissible following *'anna*, from which this *'an* was created).⁷³

At the end of chapter 247, which is devoted to nouns introducing a conditional clause such as *man* 'whoever', Sībawayhi compares two structures in which *'an* occurs in the sense of *'annahu*, after a verb denoting certain knowledge and before a nominal sentence.⁷⁴ Sībawayhi's examples for the first structure are *'alimtu 'an lā yaqūlu dāka* 'I knew that he would not say that', in which the *taqdīr* structure contains *'annahu* instead of *'an*, and Qur'ān 20:89 cited above, consisting of the utterance *'allā yarjī'u*. As examples for the second structure, he quotes two lines of poetry and the sentence *qad 'alimtu 'an 'Abdu llāhi munṭaliqun* 'I knew that 'Abdallāh was going away'. Sībawayhi argues that the structure with a nominal sentence following *'an* is not as (grammatically) good (*qawīyy*) in speech as the structure with a *marfū'* verb following *'an*: in the latter there is a compensation for shortening *'annahu* to *'an* (in the form of an element that

⁷² For the whole discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 431, 10–14.

⁷³ It seems that al-Mubarrad's explanation is identical to Sībawayhi's. See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* III, 10, 1–3. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) I, 239, 6–8; II, 796, 7–9.

⁷⁴ For the whole discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 390, 18ff.

separates between 'an and the following *marfū'* verb), while in the former no such compensation is found.⁷⁵

d. 'An *al-muxaffafa* before conditional clauses

Sibawayhi discusses the structure in which 'an precedes a conditional clause in chapter 247.⁷⁶ His example is 'alimtu 'an man ya'tinī 'ātihi 'I knew that whoever comes to me, I will come to him'. Sibawayhi contends that the speaker has in mind the concealed attached pronoun *-hu*, so that the *taqdīr* structure of this sentence is 'alimtu 'annahu man ya'tinī 'ātihi. He concludes that there is no other way to analyze this sentence syntactically.

3.1.2.2. *The usage of 'an following verbs denoting doubt*

Sibawayhi emphasizes that 'an after verbs denoting doubt, such as *zanantu*, *ḥasibtu*, *xiltu* and *ra'aytu*,⁷⁷ can either cause the following verb to be *manṣūb* or have the meaning of 'annahu, the following verb being *marfū'*.⁷⁸ Sibawayhi first demonstrates the second possibility: *ḥasibtu 'allā yaqūlu dāka* 'I thought that he would not say that' and *'urā 'an sayaf'alu dāka* 'I think that he would do that'. His third example is a verse with the reading of the relevant verb with *raf'*: *waḥasibū 'an lā takūnu fitnatun* 'and they thought that there would not be a punishment'⁷⁹ (Qur'ān 5:71).⁸⁰ Sibawayhi states that the *raf'* mood in these examples is due to the fact that the speaker is certain that the action which the verb following 'an denotes will take place. In other words, a verb denoting doubt and preceding 'an may be perceived by the speaker as possessing a meaning close to that of a verb denoting certain knowledge (after which a *marfū'* verb appears). After discussing this possibility of *raf'*, Sibawayhi goes on to the possibility of putting the verb in *naṣb*, under the same circumstances. In this possibility, the verbs denoting doubt are posited as the verbs whose basic meaning is fear, *xašītu* and *xiftu* 'I was afraid', after which 'an is followed by a *manṣūb* verb (see §3.1.2.3). Three examples of this type are the following: the sentence *zanantu 'allā taf'ala dāka* 'I thought that you would not do that'; the verse *taẓunnu 'an yuf'ala bihā fāqiratun* 'they fear

⁷⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 391, 4–7. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Ta'līqa II*, 182, 1–8, where the author interprets Sibawayhi's view on this issue.

⁷⁶ For references, see note 74 above.

⁷⁷ For the verb *ra'ā*, see note 68 above.

⁷⁸ For the whole discussion, see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 430, 8–17.

⁷⁹ The word *fitna* has several meanings; for some of them, see Lane, *Lexicon VI*, 2335c–2336a.

⁸⁰ It should be noticed that in all these examples there is a separation between 'an and the *marfū'* verb, according to Sibawayhi's principle as explained in §3.1.1.

(literally: think) that a big disaster will occur to them' (Qur'ān 75:25); the verse *'in ẓannā 'an yuqīmā ḥudūda llāhi* 'if they think that they keep the rules of God' (Qur'ān 2:230). Sībawayhi adds that the addition of the negative particle *lā* following *'an* does not change the utterance. He does not elucidate this statement, but it seems probable that his intention is that the mood of the verb following *'an* does not change due to this addition.

3.1.2.3. *'An following verbs denoting fear and their similarity to those denoting desire* After Sībawayhi's discussion of the verbs denoting doubt, he discusses those denoting fear, such as *xašitu*.⁸¹ He says that what hinders these verbs from being like verbs denoting doubt on the one hand and certain knowledge on the other, after which the *rafʿ* can be found and is found, respectively, is that for the speaker the utterance which *'an* introduces does not indicate an action that has taken place in reality, but rather one about which it is not known whether it has or has not taken place. This aspect is common to both verbs denoting fear and those denoting desire, such as *'arjū* 'I want' and *'aṭma'u* 'I wish'. Verbs denoting fear and desire according to Sībawayhi do not inform of an occurrence of a certain action in reality, but rather of a fear and a desire, respectively, that this action will take place. It is thus improper to say *'arjū 'annaka tafʿalu* 'I want that you do [something]' and *'aṭma'u 'annaka fā'ilun* 'I wish that you do [something]', since the particle *'anna* introduces a clause implying an occurrence in reality. Nevertheless, Sībawayhi ends his discussion saying that an example such as *'axšā 'an lā tafʿalu* 'I fear that you shall not so [something]' is possible, if the speaker wishes to inform of an action which he believes will occur in reality. In other words, if the speaker intends that the clause introduced by *'an* indicate an action conceived as taking place in reality, the verb following *'an* may be *marfūʿ*, even if the main verb in the sentence denotes fear. Sībawayhi remarks, however, that this structure is not common in speech.

From this discussion it is clearly inferred that Sībawayhi's distinction between using *'an* with a *marfūʿ* and a *maṣṣūb* verb, or in other words between the *rafʿ* and *naṣb* moods, respectively, corresponds to the way the speaker conceives the action that this verb conveys: whether he believes that it did (or will) occur in reality or he is uncertain about this.

⁸¹ For the whole discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 430, 17–21.

3.1.2.4. *The use of 'an al-muxaffafa in order to convey du'ā' 'invocation'* According to Sībawayhi, when using 'an in the sense of 'annahu in order to express du'ā', the particles *sa-* or *qad* should not separate it from the following verb (unlike other contexts, where separation is required; see §3.1.1 above).⁸² Accordingly, one says 'amā 'an jazāka llāhu xayran 'indeed, may God have rewarded you well' and 'amā 'an yağfiru llāhu laka 'indeed, may God forgive you'. Sībawayhi does not elaborate on the possibility of pronouncing the verb directly, with no separation, after 'an in the sense of 'annahu; he merely says 'innamā 'ajāzūhu li'annahu du'ā'un 'they (i.e. the speakers) allowed it (i.e. this structure) because it is a du'ā'. As Jahn correctly notes,⁸³ the use of *sa-* or *qad* is not possible in the context of a du'ā', since both imply that the action of the following verb is certain, which is not the case in a du'ā', as far as the speaker is concerned. As for *lā* and *sawfa*, the two other particles which Sībawayhi mentions in other contexts as separators between 'an in the sense of 'annahu and the following verb, Jahn refers in his note to *lā* alone, correctly saying that it cannot be used in this context, because it would change the meaning of the du'ā' from positive to negative. As for *sawfa*, it is rather clear that it has the same meaning and function as the prefix *sa-* and is thus treated in the same way. For the explicit explanations given by al-Mubarrad, al-Sīrāfi and other grammarians why any of the separating particles is not needed in the context of a du'ā', see §3.3.2.4.

3.1.2.5. *Structures in which 'an may be followed by a verb in raf', naṣb or jazm* One of the first sentence types which Sībawayhi introduces in chapter 276 is *katabtu 'ilayhi 'an* 'I wrote to him that'.⁸⁴ Sībawayhi says that the verb following 'an in this structure may be put in any of the three moods: one can say *katabtu 'ilayhi 'an lā yaqul dāka* 'I wrote to him: let him not say that!', *katabtu 'ilayhi 'an lā yaqūla dāka* 'I wrote to him that he should not say that' and *katabtu 'ilayhi 'an lā taqūlu dāka* 'I wrote to him that you do not say that'.⁸⁵ Sībawayhi explains that in the first example the *jazm* is used because of the imperative nature of what is expressed;

⁸² For the whole discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 431, 3–4. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) I, 240, 4–9; II, 210, 7–10.

⁸³ See Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 128, note 9 of chapter 276.

⁸⁴ For the whole discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 430, 5–8. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 210, 12–14; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 143, 11–14 (part of *mas'ala* 150); al-Harawī, *Azhiya*, 67, –2–68, 2.

⁸⁵ For two modern studies that quote and elucidate these three examples, see Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 454, note 4 (part of §223); Fischer, *'An*, 25–26.

in the second example, the *naṣb* is used because the speaker's intention is to express a purpose, as if the speaker had said [*katabtu 'ilayhi*] *li'an lā yaqūla dāka* 'I wrote to him in order that he not say that'; and in the third example the *rafʿ* is used because the speaker reports an occurrence which took place in reality, as if what was said were *katabtu 'ilayhi li'annaka lā taqūlu dāka* 'I wrote to him because you do not say that' or *katabtu 'ilayhi bi'annaka lā taqūlu dāka* 'I wrote to him that you do not say that'. Sibawayhi emphasizes that in this last example the speaker reports an action occurring in reality. This is further evidence that the *rafʿ* mood according to Sibawayhi presents an actual occurrence, in contrast to *naṣb*, which involves only a potential occurrence.

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' contends that in some structures the verb following *'an* is *marfū'*, in others—*manṣūb*, and that there are also cases in which both moods are possible. Some of these are also mentioned by Sibawayhi, but explained differently. Here are *al-Farrā'*'s views on these structures.

a. In his extensive discussion of the particle *ḥattā*, *al-Farrā'* contends that when the following verb is negated by *lā*, both *naṣb* and *rafʿ* are possible. However, the *rafʿ* mood is possible only if *lā* can be replaced by *laysa* without rendering the sentence ungrammatical. In other words, the *naṣb* mood is the only possibility when *lā* cannot be replaced by *laysa* (for his theory concerning *ḥattā*, see chapter 8, §3.2.1.2). *Al-Farrā'* says that the same rule applies to the mood of the verb following *'an* when it is negated by *lā*. He demonstrates his view with two Qur'ānic verses in which the verb is negated by *lā* and can be put in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*. The verses are Qur'ān 5:71 and 20:89, cited by Sibawayhi, too, and discussed in §3.1.2.2 and §3.1.2.1-a, respectively.⁸⁶ *Al-Farrā'* explicitly says that had the verbs not been negated by *lā*, only the *naṣb* mood would have been possible. He argues that *rafʿ* is possible in these contexts, since *lā* can be replaced by *laysa* and the sentence remains permissible, as in *ḥasibtu 'an lasta tadhabu fataxallaftu* 'I thought that you were not going and thus I stayed behind', which is equivalent to *ḥasibtu 'an lā tadhaba/u fataxallaftu*, in which the verb following *'an* may be either *manṣūb* or *marfū'*. But when *lā* cannot be replaced by *laysa* only *naṣb* is possible, as in *'aradtu 'an lā taqūla dāka* 'I wanted that you do not say that'. *Al-Farrā'* himself does not explain the logic behind his theory and I will shortly offer a possible

⁸⁶ For the whole discussion, see *al-Farrā'*, *Ma'ānī* I, 135, 9ff.

explanation. In any case, the examples which al-Farrāʾ introduces in his discussion show that like Sibawayhi (and most subsequent grammarians), he also believes that after verbs denoting doubt (such as *ḥasiba*), the verb following *ʿan* may be *manṣūb* or *marfūʿ*, whereas after verbs denoting a desire (such as *ʿarāda*), only *naṣb* is possible.

Despite al-Farrāʾs explicit statement that it is the existence of *lā* in these examples that makes it permissible to put the verb in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*,⁸⁷ he then apparently contradicts himself and says that it is possible to find a *marfūʿ* verb following *ʿan* even if it is not negated by *lā*. Thus al-Farrāʾ explains the *rafʿ* mood in the sentence *ḥasibtu ʿan taqūlu dāka* ‘I thought that you said that’, in a very similar way to Sibawayhi: *liʾanna l-hāʾa taḥsunu fi ʿan fataqūlu ḥasibtu ʾannahu yaqūlu*⁸⁸ *dāka* ‘because the [attached pronoun] -hu can be joined to *ʿan* [thus creating *ʾannahu*], as in the example *ḥasibtu ʾannahu yaqūlu dāka*’.

Another reference to the replacement between *lā* and *laysa*, found in another place in his *Maʿānī* and also related to the mood of the verb following *ʿan*, elucidates al-Farrāʾs intention and may even resolve the contradiction referred to in the previous paragraph. The context is al-Farrāʾs commentary on Qurʾān 3:41, in which the verb following *ʿan* is negated by *lā*: *qāla rabbi jʿal li ʾāyatan qāla ʾāyatuka ʾallā tukallima/u l-nāsa talāṭata ʾayyāmin ʾillā ramzan* ‘he said: my lord, give me an omen. [God] said [in response]: your omen is that you shall not speak to the people for three days but by signs’. According to al-Farrāʾ, if the verb following *ʿan* denotes a real, absolute future (*al-istiqbāl al-maḥḍ*), the verb should be *manṣūb*, whereas if the present time is intended, the verb should be *marfūʿ*.⁸⁹ In view of this, it can be inferred that al-Farrāʾs intention in the replacement “test” of *lā* with *laysa* is related to the time which the negated verb conveys. If *lā* can be replaced by *laysa*, a verb denoting a present time, the negated verb may be put in *rafʿ*, because it thus does not convey an

⁸⁷ *Waʾidā ʾalqayta minhu lā lam yaqūluhu ʾillā naṣban* ‘if you remove *lā* from it (i.e. from the sentence in which *lā* negates the verb following *ʿan*), they (i.e. the speakers) will pronounce it (i.e. the verb following *ʿan*) only in *naṣb*’ (al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 135, 11–12).

⁸⁸ The change from a verb in the second person (in the first sentence with *ʿan*) to one in the third person (in the second sentence with *ʾannahu*) occurs in the printed edition (al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 136, 1–2); the difference thus either involves an inconsistency in al-Farrāʾs words or an error in the edition.

⁸⁹ See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 213, 3–6. Cf. Tawāma, *Zaman*, 58, 6–11, where al-Farrāʾs view is discussed. See further al-Naḥḥās, *ʾIrāb* I, 375, 1–2, where the author says that according to the Kūfans, the *rafʿ* mood in the above-mentioned verse is possible, because *lā* occurs there in the sense of *laysa*.

Al-Farrāʾ expresses the same opinion in his commentary on the almost identical verse Qurʾān 19:10. See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* II, 162, –3–163, 4.

action in the future. If, on the other hand, this replacement is not possible, the verb must be *manṣūb*, as it denotes a future time. If this hypothesis is correct, it means that even if the verb is not negated by *lā*, it may yet be *marfūʿ*, as long as it conveys an occurrence in the present and not in the future; this resolves the seeming contradiction mentioned above.

b. From his discussion of the line of poetry quoted in §2.4.1.2 above, *ʾaxāfu* [...] *ʾan lā ʾadūquhā*, it is clear that al-Farrāʾ allows putting the verb following *ʾan* in *rafʿ*, despite the fact that the preceding main verb denotes fear (*ʾaxāfu*). Al-Farrāʾ argues that *rafʿ* in this context is possible because the verb denoting fear in this context is similar in meaning to that of a verb denoting doubt (*ʾaxāfu* ‘I fear’ and *ʾaẓunnu* ‘I think’, respectively). Since the *rafʿ* mood is possible in the context of verbs denoting doubt, as in Qurʾān 5:71 which he cites (and which Sībawayhi cites and discusses, too; see §3.1.2.2), it is also possible in the context of *ʾaxāfu*, a verb denoting fear.⁹⁰ Al-Farrāʾ’s discussion and conclusion here resemble those of Sībawayhi in the same context (see §3.1.2.3), but whereas Sībawayhi considers the *rafʿ* mood in this context not common in speech, al-Farrāʾ does not seem to share this opinion.

c. From al-Farrāʾ’s discussion of *li-* in the structure *ʾurīdu li(ʾan) tafʿala* (see chapter 9, §5.2), two conclusions can be inferred with respect to his views on the mood of the verb following *ʾan*:

- In his opinion, the *manṣūb* verb following *ʾan* denotes an action in a future time. This is inferred from his view that *li-* can replace *ʾan* after verbs denoting a desire, since both particles necessitate that the following verb convey future and not past time.⁹¹ This view shows again that al-Farrāʾ considers the *manṣūb* verb indicating an action in a future time.
- Al-Farrāʾ argues that when the main verb in the sentence expresses doubt, *ʾan* can be followed by a verb denoting past or future, as in *ʾaẓunnu ʾan qad qāma Zaydun* ‘I think that Zayd has stood’ and *ʾaẓunnu ʾan sayaqūmu Zaydun* ‘I think that Zayd will stand’, respectively. Since after a verb of doubt *ʾan* is not necessarily followed by a verb denoting a future time, one cannot replace it with *li-* (after which the verb necessarily denotes a future time) and say **ẓanantu litaqūma* ‘I thought that you will stand’.

⁹⁰ See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* I, 146, 1–10. A similar view is attributed to *ġayr al-baṣriyyīna* ‘non-Baṣrans’ in al-Harawī, *ʾAzhīya*, 67, 4–13 and al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 186, 4–6.

⁹¹ For references and further details, see chapter 9, §5.2.

3.3. Other grammarians

3.3.1. *The syntactic contexts of 'an al-muxaffafa compared to 'an al-maṣḍariyya*

3.3.1.1. *Grammarians who posit a compulsory separation between 'an al-muxaffafa and the following verb* Most grammarians emphasize, along with Sībawayhi, that in the case of 'an in the sense of 'annahu which is followed by an imperfect verb, 'an and this verb must be separated by one of the particles *lā*, *sawfa*, *sa-* or *qad*.⁹²

Al-Jurjānī and al-Zamaxšārī are two of the first grammarians who say that not only *lā* but all negative particles can be used as separators between 'an and a following *marfū'* verb.⁹³ Many later grammarians have adopted this view as well.⁹⁴ Al-Jurjānī, al-Zamaxšārī and some of these later grammarians quote two Qur'ānic verses in which the separators are the negative particles *lan* and *lam*, each of which is also considered the 'āmil of the following *manṣūb* verb. These are 'ayaḥsibu 'an *lan* *yaqdira 'alayhi 'aḥadun* 'does he think that no one shall overcome him?' (Qur'ān 90:5) and 'ayaḥsibu 'an *lam* *yarahu 'aḥadun* 'does he think that no one shall see him?' (Qur'ān 90:7).

3.3.1.2. *Grammarians who do not posit a compulsory separation between 'an al-muxaffafa and the following verb* Al-Zajjājī is the earliest grammarian who does not refer at all to the separation between 'an *al-muxaffafa* and the following verb. The salient evidence that in his view such a separation is not necessary is one of his examples for 'an *al-muxaffafa*: 'alimtu 'an *taqūmu* 'I knew that you would rise'.⁹⁵ In his other

⁹² See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 31, 10ff.; III, 5, 9ff.; Ibn al-Sarrāj, 'Uṣūl (1996) I, 239, -2-240, 4; al-Sirāfi cited in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 128, note 5 of chapter 276; al-Fārisi, *Manṭūra*, 142, -3-143, 10 (*mas'ala* 149); Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* II, 682, 4-14; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 301, 11-13; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* IV, 65, 6-7.

⁹³ See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 109, 1-5; 110, 3; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 138, 1-2; 138, 12-13; al-Zamaxšārī, *Aḥājī*, 80, 5-9 (beginning of *mas'ala* 39); al-Zamaxšārī, *Unmūdaj*, 104, -5--4.

⁹⁴ See Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 228, 5-229, 2; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* II, 472, 11-12; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* I, 221, 2 last lines; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 145, -2-146, 6; Ibn Mu'tī, *Fuṣūl*, 202, 2-3; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* II, 447, 3-11; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 182, 5-183, 1; 184, 9-11; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 191, 12ff.; al-Astarābāḍī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 29, -1-30, 8; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Šarḥ*, 130, 9ff.; Ibn Abi Rabi', *Kāfi* III, 902, 10-903, 1; al-Murādi, *Janā*, 218, 8ff.; Ibn Hišām, 'Awḍaḥ I, 187, -1-188, 3; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 62, 7ff.; al-Makkūdī, *Šarḥ* I, 238, 9ff.; Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 135, 2-7; al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* I, 322, 1ff.; al-Suyūṭī, 'Ašbāḥ (1998) I, 280, -5--3.

⁹⁵ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 206, -2-207, 2, where al-Zajjājī explicitly says that 'an in this example is 'an *al-muxaffafa* and that its *taqdīr* structure is 'alimtu 'annaka *taqūmu*.

examples the *marfūʿ* verb is separated from the preceding *ʿan*, but this example and the fact that al-Zajjājī says nothing about such a separation prove that he does not consider it necessary. Indeed, for this view al-Zajjājī is criticized by some of his commentators.⁹⁶

Al-Harawī, too, does not contend that the separation between *ʿan al-muxaffafa* and the following verb is compulsory. In his opinion, when the verb is *marfūʿ* and *ʿan* precedes it, it is best (*al-ʾaḥsan*) to separate these two by one of the particles mentioned already by Sibawayhi.⁹⁷ Al-Harawī thus accepts the usage of *ʿan al-muxaffafa* with a *marfūʿ* verb directly following it.

Al-Astarābādī, too, says that it is possible to find *ʿan al-muxaffafa* without an *ʾiwaḍ* ‘compensation’, i.e. without a particle separating it from the following verb. He says that al-Mubarrad reports that this usage exists among *al-baḡādida* ‘the people of Baghdad’, and provides as an example the sentence *ʾalimtu ʿan taxruju* ‘I knew that you would go out’. Al-Astarābādī concludes with the comment that this construction is exceptional.⁹⁸

3.3.2. *The semantic contexts of ʿan al-muxaffafa compared to ʿan al-maṣḍariyya*

The vast majority of grammarians emphasize that *ʿan* followed by a verb in *naṣb* is used after verbs denoting uncertainty with respect to an action, such as verbs of fear and desire, whereas *ʿanna* followed by a noun in *naṣb* is used after verbs indicating that the speaker is certain that the relevant action has occurred or will occur in reality, such as verbs denoting certain knowledge.⁹⁹ Only al-Astarābādī holds an exceptional view with regards to the syntactic contexts in which *ʿanna* is used.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ See, for example, al-Baṭalyawī, *ʾIṣlāḥ*, 258, 1–10.

⁹⁷ See al-Harawī, *ʾAzhīya*, 65, 3–67, 13. Cf. Ibn al-Šajārī, *ʾAmālī*, 419, 5ff.; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* I, 219, 8; 221, 4ff.; II, 112, 1–6. See further Abū Ḥayyān, *Manhaj*, 84, 24ff. (for the Arabic text and its translation into German, see Bergter, *ʾInna*, 52, 3ff. and 114, 20ff., respectively), where Abū Ḥayyān expresses his view that the separation between *ʿan* and the following verb is not compulsory but only preferable, adding that other grammarians consider it compulsory.

⁹⁸ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 32, 1–2. Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Taxliṣ*, 383, 2ff., where the author characterizes the separation between *ʿan al-muxaffafa* and the *marfūʿ* verb as occurring *ġāliban* ‘usually’.

⁹⁹ See, for example, al-Fārisī, *Taʾlīq* II, 275, 3 last lines (and also note 4 there, where a similar opinion of al-Sirāfi is quoted); al-Fārisī, *ʾIdāḥ* I, 482, 6–9 (cf. the commentaries of al-Jurjānī and Ibn Abī Rabī in al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* I, 482, 11–483, 2 and Ibn Abī Rabī, *Kāfi* III, 942, 7ff.); al-Fārisī, *Baṣriyyāt* I, 705–711 (*maṣʾala* 83); al-Fārisī, *ʾIḡfāl* I, 122, –6–123, 7; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 193, 3ff.; al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*, 191a, –2–192a, 1.

¹⁰⁰ In al-Astarābādī’s opinion *ʿanna* can be used whether the main verb preceding it denotes certain knowledge or doubt. He quotes and opposes the opinions of Sibawayhi and

As a rule, most grammarians argue that 'an following verbs denoting fear and desire is followed by a *manšūb* verb, whereas 'an after verbs denoting certain knowledge is followed by a verb in *rafʿ* (this 'an being referred to as 'an *al-muxaffafa*). As for 'an after verbs denoting doubt, it can be followed either by a verb in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*.

One of the grammarians who elucidate this usage of 'an in a clear way is Ibn al-Sarrāj.¹⁰¹ He argues that the verbs are divided into three kinds (with respect to the speaker's view of a certain action as known, expected, etc.): verbs denoting certain knowledge, such as *'alimtu* 'I knew'; those denoting expectation, such as *rajawtu* 'I wanted' and *xiftu* 'I was afraid'; and those which are intermediate between the first two, having the potential to denote both certain knowledge and expectation, such as *ẓanantu* and *ḥasibtu* 'I thought'. He goes on to say that 'an occurring after verbs of the first kind is 'an *al-muxaffafa*, followed by a verb in *rafʿ*, whereas 'an occurring after verbs of the second kind is 'an *al-nāšiba*, followed by a verb in *naṣb*. Verbs of the third kind can be followed either by a verb in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, according to the speaker's intention: *'in kāna ḥisbānuka qadī staqarra kānat muxaffafatan minā l-ṭaqīlati wa'in ḥamaltahu 'alā l-šakki kānat xafīfatan* 'if your thought is solid (i.e. denoting certain knowledge), it (i.e. 'an) is 'an *al-muxaffafa* [occurring in the position of 'annahu, after which the verb is *marfū*], and if you consider it (i.e. your thought) as [denoting] doubt, it (i.e. 'an) is 'an *al-xafīfa* [after which the verb is *manšūb*']'.¹⁰² An example for this third kind, according to Ibn al-Sarrāj and other grammarians,

al-Zamaxšarī (and most other grammarians as well) who maintain that 'anna implies the certain occurrence of the action expressed in the clause it introduces. He argues that 'anna emphasizes and confirms the relevant action, whether what precedes it is a verb denoting certain knowledge or doubt. One of his arguments is that had the meanings of 'anna and *al-tamannī* 'wish' contradicted each other ('anna implying certainty and *al-tamannī* a wish, necessarily for an uncertain action), one could not have said *layta 'annaka qā'imun* 'I wish you stood'. Since this sentence is possible and normal in the language, he believes it proves that 'anna does not necessarily imply certainty. See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 27, 6–28, 7. Al-Astarābādī's opinion seems to correspond the views of Fleischer and Fischer in this aspect, discussed in §2.4.1.1 above.

¹⁰¹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 209, 3ff. For a similar discussion, see al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 72, 6–73, 5.

¹⁰² See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 209, 11–12. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Ta'līq* II, 276, 3–7; al-Fārisī, *Īdāh* I, 482, 6–9; 483, 4–5; 486, 5–6 (and the commentary in al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* I, 486, 8ff.); al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 236, –3–237, 4; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 794, –2–795, –4; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 309, 1ff.; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 138, 14ff. (and the detailed commentary in al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 185, 2ff.); Ibn al-Šajarī, *Amālī*, 420–421; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 301, 11–18; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* IV, 64, 11–65, 5; al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 194, 2–11; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 193, 3–194, 4; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Amālī* II, 727–728 ('imlā' 40); Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 174, 3ff.; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 475, 20–476, 4.

is Qurʾān 5:71, with the two readings of the relevant verb in *naṣb* and *rafʿ*, cited already by Sibawayhi and discussed in §3.1.2.2 above.

Al-Ḥarīrī in an exceptional discussion of the orthography of the compound *ʾan+lā* states that there are two ways to write this compound, depending on the nature of this *ʾan*: *ʾan al-xaḥḥa* or *ʾan al-muxaffafa*, followed by a verb in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, respectively.¹⁰³ In the case of *ʾan al-xaḥḥa*, the orthography of *ʾan+lā* is *ʾallā* (one word, in which the final *-n* of *ʾan* is assimilated to the *l-* of *lā*), and in the case of *ʾan al-muxaffafa*—*ʾan lā* (two separate words). Al-Ḥarīrī argues that the former can be compared to the case of *lā* adjoined to the conditional particle *ʾin* to form the word *ʾillā*: *ʾan* is an *ʾāmil* that affects the following verb exactly as *ʾin* is an *ʾāmil* that governs the *ʾirāb* of the following clause. In the second kind, *ʾan al-muxaffafa* is not an *ʾāmil* affecting the following verb and it is therefore written separately when *lā* joins it. I have not been able to find a similar discussion or opinion among the grammarians and/or Qurʾān commentators, so this theory probably has no basis in the linguistic reality.¹⁰⁴

3.3.2.1. *The usage of ʾan following verbs denoting certain knowledge*
Most grammarians argue, like Sibawayhi, that when *ʾan* follows verbs denoting certain knowledge, such as *ʾalimtu* ‘I knew’ and *istayqantu* ‘I knew for sure’, the mood of the following verb is *rafʿ*. Al-Aḫḫaṣ, for example, says that the usage of *ʾan al-xaḥḥa* (followed by a verb in *naṣb*) is limited to describing actions which did not take place in reality.¹⁰⁵ Al-Mubarrad expresses a similar opinion, saying that this usage is limited to actions which are not *tābita* ‘solid’, i.e. occur in reality, but rather *maṭlūba* ‘desired’ or *mutawaqqiʿa* ‘expected’. Therefore, when *ʾan* follows a verb that denotes certain knowledge, it is the type that has the meaning of *ʾannah*, with no influence on the following verb.¹⁰⁶

Al-Astarābādī is unique in arguing that since *ʾan al-muxaffafa* can be used after verbs denoting doubt, if they are conceived as having the meaning of certain knowledge (see §3.3.2.2 below), some (i.e. grammarians) by analogy allow the usage of *ʾan al-nāṣiba* after verbs denoting

¹⁰³ For the whole discussion, see al-Ḥarīrī, *Durra*, 203, –1–204, 15 (cf. the French translation in de Sacy, *Anthologie*, 116–117).

¹⁰⁴ The only sources where a similar discussion is introduced are the modern studies by Vernier and Ḥasan, neither of which mention al-Ḥarīrī’s name as their source. See Vernier, *Grammaire* I, 468, §515.7; Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 298, 11 last lines, where the author argues that the orthography *ʾan lā* should be used not only when *ʾan* is *ʾan al-muxaffafa* (as al-Ḥarīrī mentions), but also in other kinds of *ʾan* which are not *ʾan al-xaḥḥa*.

¹⁰⁵ See al-Aḫḫaṣ, *Maʾānī* (1985) I, 303, 11–304, 4.

¹⁰⁶ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* I, 49, 1–4; II, 30, 8–12; III, 7, 5–11.

certain knowledge, if they are conceived as having the meaning of doubt, as in *'alimtu 'an yaxruja Zaydun* 'I thought Zayd would exit' (and not 'I knew...').¹⁰⁷

3.3.2.2. *The usage of 'an following verbs denoting doubt* Many grammarians contend, like Sibawayhi, that both *naṣb* and *rafʿ* are possible in a verb following *'an*, when this particle is preceded by a verb denoting doubt.¹⁰⁸ One of these grammarians is al-Mubarrad, who argues that the *naṣb* mood is explained by the fact that *'an* in such a case behaves syntactically like *'an* following a verb denoting desire, whereas the *rafʿ* mood in the same context is explained by conceiving this *'an* as one following a verb denoting certain knowledge.¹⁰⁹

According to al-Naḥḥās, when the main verb in the sentence denotes thought and doubt, putting the verb following *'an* in *rafʿ* is better than putting it in *naṣb*, because verbs denoting thought and doubt are similar to those denoting certain knowledge.¹¹⁰ Ibn Mālik and some subsequent grammarians claim that, to the contrary, *naṣb* in the context of verbs denoting thought and doubt is better than *rafʿ*.¹¹¹

3.3.2.3. *The usage of 'an following verbs denoting fear and the similarity to verbs denoting desire* According to al-Axfaš *'an* followed by a verb in *naṣb* is used in utterances which are *ḡayr wājib* 'non indicative, not denoting certainty', for example after verbs denoting desire, as in *'urīdu 'an ta'tīyanī* 'I want that you come to me'. Al-Axfaš explicitly says that this kind of *'an* is limited to describing actions which have not occurred (or will not occur) in reality, and that the case of verbs denoting desire is thus similar to that of verbs denoting fear, as in *xašītu 'an lā tukrimanī*

¹⁰⁷ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 30, 15–31, 2. Cf. Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 12, –2–13, 2, where the author ascribes this opinion to al-Farrā' and Ibn al-Anbārī; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 63, –2ff.; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 88, 12ff.

¹⁰⁸ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 303, 9–11.

¹⁰⁹ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* I, 49, 5–8; III, 7–12. See further *ibid.* II, 31, 1–9, where the author claims that after verbs denoting doubt *'anna* is more common than *'an al-muxaffafa*.

¹¹⁰ See al-Naḥḥās, *ʾIṣṣāb* II, 32, –3–33, 4. Cf. al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1994) III, 373, 4–6.

¹¹¹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 7, –3–8, 2. See further Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 476, 1–4; Abū Ḥayyān, *Iṭiṣāf* IV, 1639, 5 last lines (as well as Abū Ḥayyān in his *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ*, quoted in Muftī, *Qurrā'*, 136, 7–10); Ibn Hišām, *ʾAwḍaḥ* II, 76, 1–5; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 64, 3–7; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 60, 5–8; Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 926, 5–6; al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* II, 188, 4–7; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ al-'alfiyya*, 149, –5–3.

'I feared that you would not respect me'.¹¹² Nevertheless, al-Axfaš, similarly to Sībawayhi, allows the verb to be put in *rafʿ* in sentences introduced by verbs denoting fear (i.e. to pronounce the last example as *xašitu ʿan lā tukrimunī*), if the speaker conceives the action conveyed by the clause which *ʿan* introduces as a fact equivalent to certain knowledge, as if what was said were *xašitu ʿannaka lā tukrimunī*.¹¹³ Ibn al-Sarrāj expresses a similar view on verbs denoting desire, such as *rajawtu* 'I wanted', and attributes to al-Māzinī the explanation that there are instances in which the verb following *ʿan* in these contexts is *marfūʿ*, since the speaker views the action which this verb conveys as a fact. However, he adds that these instances are exceptional and unusual.¹¹⁴ Other grammarians express similar opinions with respect to verbs denoting fear as well as those denoting desire.¹¹⁵

3.3.2.4. *The use of ʿan al-muxaffafa to convey duʿā ʿinvocationʼ* In his *Muqtaḍab*, al-Mubarrad devotes a chapter to *ʿan* in the sense of *ʿannahu*, which is used in order to convey *duʿā*.¹¹⁶ Al-Mubarrad's discussion of this issue differs in two important points from Sībawayhi's parallel discussion (see §3.1.2.4):

- a. Whereas Sībawayhi mentions only the two particles *sa-* and *qad* as separators between this kind of *ʿan* and the following verb, al-Mubarrad refers to *lā* and *sawfa* as well, in other words to all four particles which are used, according to Sībawayhi, as such separators in other contexts. Al-Mubarrad explains why none of the four is adequate in the context of the *duʿā*: *qad*, *sa-* and *sawfa* would change the utterance from *duʿā* to *ʿixbār* 'an indicative utterance' (i.e. stating a fact, unlike *duʿā*); *lā* would change the meaning of the *duʿā* from positive to negative. Therefore, al-Mubarrad concludes, there is no separation between *ʿan* and the following verb in the context of *duʿā*.
- b. Whereas Sībawayhi mentions *ʿan* alone in this context, al-Mubarrad emphasizes that both *ʿan* and *ʿin* can be used, as in (very similar to

¹¹² Cf. the view of al-Mubarrad introduced at the beginning of §3.3.2.1, the reference given in note 106.

¹¹³ See al-Axfaš, *Maʿānī* (1985) I, 303, 11–304, 7. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1640, 3 last lines, where Abū Ḥayyān cites this opinion of al-Axfaš, and correctly notes that Sībawayhi shares it, too.

¹¹⁴ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 209, 15–16.

¹¹⁵ See al-Harawī, *ʿAzhīya*, 64, 4–12; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* I, 483, 1–2; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 309, 3 last lines; Ibn al-Šajārī, *ʿAmālī*, 421.

¹¹⁶ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* III, 9–10.

Sibawayhi's examples) *'amā 'an/in ġafara llāhu laka* 'indeed, may God have forgiven you' and *'amā 'an/in yaġfiru llāhu laka* 'indeed, may God forgive you'. Al-Mubarrad nevertheless determines that the usage of *'an* is better.¹¹⁷

4. THE SEPARATION BETWEEN NAŠB-INDUCING 'AN AND THE FOLLOWING VERB

4.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi briefly refers to this issue in chapters 57, 256 and 274 of his *Kitāb*. In these places he refers to the particles *'an* and *kay*, both of which cause the following verb to be *manṣūb*, and says that they should not be separated from the following verb.¹¹⁸ For further details, see chapter 3, §5.1.

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not explicitly refer to this issue.

4.3. *Other grammarians*

Some grammarians mention that *'an* which induces the following verb to take *našb* should not be separated from this verb.¹¹⁹ Ibn al-Sarrāj, like Sibawayhi, compares *'an* to *kay* in this respect.¹²⁰ Ibn Jinnī argues that the only possible separation is by the negative particle *lā*.¹²¹ Abū Ḥayyān mentions a few opinions on this subject.¹²² He claims that Sibawayhi and most grammarians do not allow any separation; some grammarians allow a *ẓarf*, i.e. an adverbial accusative of time or place, to come between the

¹¹⁷ Cf. al-Zamaxšārī, *Aḥājī*, 81, 10ff., where the author also refers to the possibility of using *'in* in this structure.

¹¹⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 124, 2–3; 406, 1–4; 428, 6, respectively.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 31, 2–5 (cf. al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 194, 12–15, citing al-'Ukbarī); Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 194, 11; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjūh*, 518, –5–4; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 12, 1–2; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 62, 1–3.

¹²⁰ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 231, 8–11.

¹²¹ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* II, 680, 8–10. Cf. al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 112, 11–12. See further Hasan, *Naḥw* IV, 283 and Ya'qūb, *Ḥurūf*, 160b, –2–161a, 3, where the two modern researchers express the same opinion as Ibn Jinnī.

¹²² For the whole discussion, see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1641, 6–15. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāh* (1998) III, 17, 5–9 and al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 90, –2–91, 5, where al-Suyūṭī quotes some of Abū Ḥayyān's words. See also Abū l-Makārim, *Ẓawāhir*, 292, –6–3, where the author refers to the opinions mentioned by Abū Ḥayyān.

two; and the Kūfans allow a conditional clause between them and argue that a verb that is syntactically dependent on 'an can be either *manṣūb* (due to the effect of 'an) or *majzūm* (being a *jawāb* to the conditional protasis), as in the example 'aradtu 'an 'in tazurnī 'azūraka/'azurka 'I wanted that, if you visit me, I visit you'.

5. CONCLUSION

This chapter is devoted to 'an, the syntactically most complex of the particles after which the verb is *manṣūb*, under certain conditions. When 'an is followed by a *manṣūb* verb it is what grammarians commonly call 'an *al-nāṣiba*, the 'an that induces the *naṣb* mood, while 'an that precedes a *marfū'* verb is called 'an *al-muxaffafa*, considered as possessing the meaning of 'annahu and having no syntactic influence on the following verb. It is quite salient, as Fischer notes (see §2.4.1.1-b and the reference in note 54), that there are many contexts in which 'an is used in Arabic: followed by an imperfect verb in *naṣb* or *raf'*, a verb in the imperative, a perfect verb or a particle.

Most grammarians recognize four different kinds of 'an, two of which have an impact on the mood of the following verb; these were extensively discussed above:¹²³

- a. 'An inducing the *naṣb* mood in the following verb, called 'an *al-xaffifa l-nāṣiba* (or simply 'an *al-xaffifa* and 'an *al-nāṣiba*). According to most grammarians, the *manṣūb* verb following this kind of 'an indicates an action in the future. However, grammarians also provide numerous examples in which such a verb is unexpectedly *marfū'* or *majzūm*.
- b. 'An having the meaning of 'annahu, called 'an *al-muxaffafa min al-taqīla* (or simply 'an *al-muxaffafa*). According to Sībawayhi and most grammarians this 'an can introduce nominal sentences, conditional sentences and clauses beginning with a *marfū'* verb. In the *taqdīr* structure this kind of 'an occupies the position of 'annahu, and like the latter is deemed to have no syntactic effect on the following verb in the pronounced sentence. Sībawayhi and most grammarians require that when it is used before a verb in *raf'* these two be separated

¹²³ The other two kinds are 'an *al-mufasssira*, which has the same function as the colon in the western punctuation system, and 'an *al-zā'ida*, which has no syntactic role or semantic meaning. These are not treated in this work.

by one of the particles *lā*, *sawfa*, *sa-* or *qad*. In addition, the semantic contexts in which it is used are presented as opposite to those in which *'an al-nāṣiba* is used: whereas *'an al-muxaffafa* follows verbs denoting certain knowledge, *'an al-nāṣiba* occurs after other verbs, for example those that denote desire or fear. Despite these syntactic and semantic characteristics that *'an al-nāṣiba* and *'an al-muxaffafa* allegedly have, the grammarians cite numerous examples in which *'an al-muxaffafa* occurs directly before a verb in *raf'*, without any separation between them, as well as others in which this *'an* does not follow a verb denoting certain knowledge.

The grammarians' division of *'an* into the four different kinds is meant to explain the variety of contexts in which this particle can occur in Arabic. However, this division does not account for numerous examples, many of which are introduced by the grammarians themselves, in which the mood of the verb following *'an* is not as expected according to the grammarians' own rules. In some examples the verb is *marfū'* instead of an expected *naṣb*, and in others the verb is *majzūm*. Although many of these examples are taken from poetry, in which such irregularities can be explained by poetic license, they also seem to represent a feature of Arabic speech. To these examples we should add the evidence for dialectal differences in the mood of the verb following *'an*. It seems that the best explanation for the complexity which the usages of *'an* display can be ascribed in large measure to two causes: the historical development of *'an*'s functions and the different syntactic ways speakers perceived that it could and should be used; and the fact that already in the early phases in the history of the language there were dialectal differences in its usage. As will be explained in the conclusion of this work, it is my belief that these two factors, historical development on the one hand and the dialectal differences on the other, can both apply not only to *'an* but also to other similar particles after which the verb is *manṣūb*, under certain circumstances. These two causes can thus explain irregularities and deviations from the rules not only with respect to *'an*, but also with respect to the *naṣb* mood in Arabic in general.

CHAPTER TWO

LAN

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Lan is one of the particles that induces the following verb to take *našb*. Sībawayhi does not devote a special chapter in his *Kitāb* to this word, but refers to it briefly in a number of passages. His references to *lan* can be divided as follows:

- a. Examples of the *našb* mood caused by *lan* in chapter 2, in which Sībawayhi discusses cases and moods. He adduces five examples with *lan*, e.g., *lan yaf'ala* 'he will not do [something]' and *lan yaf'alā* 'the two of them will not do [something]'.¹
- b. The etymology of *lan* (see §2.1).
- c. *Lan yaf'ala* is a negation of the utterance *sayaf'alu/sawfa yaf'alu* (see §4.1).
- d. *Lan* should not be separated from the following verb (see §5.1).

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not himself refer to the different uses of *lan*, although some grammarians do attribute some opinions concerning this particle to him (see §2.2, §4.2 and §5.2).

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Like Sībawayhi, most other grammarians also do not have much to say about *lan*. Some in fact do no more than mention it among the particles that induce the *našb* mood, without providing any examples or details.²

¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 2, 8; 4, 15; 4, 18; 4, 20–21; 5, 3.

² See, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 195, 1.

2. THE ETYMOLOGY OF *LAN*

The origin of the word *lan* has been disputed by grammarians and modern researchers alike. Generally speaking, the vast majority of grammarians, starting from Sibawayhi, maintain that *lan* is an independent word, not a compound of several elements, whereas others, most prominently al-Xalīl, regard it as originating from *lā+ʿan*. The position taken on the etymology of *lan* is closely related to what element one takes as inducing the verb following this particle to take *naṣb*. According to the more commonly held view presented above, *lan* is the *ʿāmil* governing the following verb, whereas according to the second above-mentioned opinion the *ʿāmil* is *ʿan*, which etymologically forms a part of *lan*.

2.1. *Sibawayhi*

In chapter 233, which deals with imperfect verbs, Sibawayhi mentions *lan* and discusses its etymology. In his opinion, *lan* is not derived from *lā+ʿan*, but is a single word made up of two consonants (*lām* and *nūn*), just like *lam*, a particle that negates the imperfect verb and induces *jazm*.³ Sibawayhi subsequently also discusses al-Xalīl's contrary view, that *lan* is derived from *lā+ʿan*, which is contracted to *lan* in speech due to its frequency of use, as people say, for example, *way lummihi* 'woe to his mother!' instead of *way li'ummihi*. As a result, speakers conceive of *lan* as one word, as they conceive of *hallā* 'is it not', derived from *hal+lā*.⁴ In other words, al-Xalīl considers *lan* to result from a contraction of the compound *lā+ʿan*, in which the long vowel of the first element and the *hamza* of the second are omitted.

As evidence against al-Xalīl Sibawayhi adduces the sentence *ʿammā Zaydan falan ʿaḍriba*⁵ 'As for Zayd, I will not hit [him]', in which the object of the verb negated by *lan* precedes the particle. If *lan* were compounded of *lā+ʿan*, argues Sibawayhi, such a sentence would have been impossible because it would have been equivalent to the ungrammatical sentence **ammā Zaydan falā l-ḍarbu lahu* (ungrammatical because the

³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 361, 18–20.

⁴ For Sibawayhi's presentation of al-Xalīl's view, see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 361, 15–17. For the transformation of *way li'ummihi* into *way lummihi* and similar changes, see al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqā* II, 126, 8–127, 3.

⁵ The version in the Derenbourg edition of the *Kitāb* is *ʿaḍribahu*, but according to manuscripts B, C and H of this edition, as well as according to most grammarians citing Sibawayhi here, the word is *ʿaḍriba*, without the attached pronoun *-hu*. Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 78, note 6 of chapter 233.

verbal noun, *al-ḍarb* in this example, cannot induce a preceding noun, *Zaydan* in this example, to take *naṣb*). Sibawayhi explains that the two utterances are equivalent if *lan* is derived from *lā+ʿan*, since *ʿan* with the following verb *ʾaḍriba* is equivalent to the verbal noun of this verb, viz. *al-ḍarb*. Thus if *lan* is conceived to be derived from *lā+ʿan*, the result is two equivalent utterances, one possible and the other impossible, and this refutes al-Xalīl's etymological explanation.⁶

2.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

In his *Maʿānī al-Farrāʾ* does not refer to the etymology of *lan*, but many grammarians attribute to him the opinion that *lā* is the *ʾaṣl* 'basic, primary form' of both *lam* and *lan*. In the former the *ʾalif* of *lā* was replaced by *mīm* and the resulting particle *lam* began to be used as a negation particle that induced the following imperfect verb to take *jazm* and transformed the time it conveyed to past. In the case of *lan* the consonant *nūn* replaced the *ʾalif* of *lā*, and *lan* came to negate the following imperfect verb, which it made *manṣūb* and caused to convey an action in the future.⁷ The grammarians who mention this view of al-Farrāʾ reject it; some, for example al-Sīrāfi, Ibn Yaʿīš and al-Astarābādī, call it an empty claim for which there is no proof. Ibn al-Ḥājjib, who also rejects the opinion attributed to al-Farrāʾ, says that it is improbable because it contradicts *qiyās* 'grammatical logic', since such replacement of consonants in a word is unattested elsewhere in the language.⁸

Al-Ṣāḡānī, one of the very few who agree with al-Farrāʾ on this issue, argues that since *lan* negates only verbs denoting an action in the future, whereas *lā* is used for negation in additional contexts (see §4.2), al-Farrāʾ's claim that *lā* is the *ʾaṣl* of *lan* is proven.⁹

⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 361, 20–21. Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 78, note 7 of chapter 233.

⁷ For some grammarians who attribute this view to al-Farrāʾ, see al-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 83, 1–3; al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 143, 10–11; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 18–19; 1166, 11–12; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 161, 4–5; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 244, 12–245, 2; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 218, 7ff.; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 36, 6–7; 37, 5; al-Ṣāḡānī, *Takmila* VI, 309b, 7–11; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 15, 12–14; al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 285, 3 last lines; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1643, 4–5; Ibn Hišām, *ʿAwḍaḥ* II, 72, 9–10; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 58, 12; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 259, 9–10; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *ʾIršād* II, 350, 11–12; al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 268, 13–14; al-Ardabilī, *Šarḥ*, 109, 4–5.

⁸ For references, see previous note. For additional arguments against the opinion attributed to al-Farrāʾ, see al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 287, 5–13; al-Azharī, *Taṣrīḥ* II, 358, 12–13. Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 203, 7–6.

⁹ See al-Ṣāḡānī, *Takmila* VI, 309b, 11–16.

2.3. Other grammarians

Other grammarians also discuss *lan*, albeit relatively briefly; their comments concern mainly the word's etymology, whether it is derived from *lā+ʿan* or not. Here is a survey of the main opinions on this issue.

2.3.1. *Al-Xalīl's opinion in his Kitāb al-ʿayn*

Al-Xalīl states that *lan* is a compound of *lā+ʿan*, part of which is omitted due to its great frequency in the language of the Bedouins.¹⁰ As explained in §2.1, Sibawayhi mentions this opinion of al-Xalīl, and also adds some examples and arguments attributed to the latter.

2.3.2. *Grammarians and lexicographers who oppose al-Xalīl's opinion*

Many grammarians and lexicographers cite al-Xalīl's opinion,¹¹ although some attribute it to al-Kisāʿī as well.¹²

Most grammarians who quote al-Xalīl's opinion use the same argument as Sibawayhi in order to refute it and sentences such as *Zaydan lan ʿaḍriba* 'I will not hit Zayd'. Many explain the idea behind Sibawayhi's argument in detail.¹³ Some grammarians mention other arguments against al-Xalīl's view:

- a. According to al-Sirāfi the utterance *lan ʿaḍriba Zaydan* is complete and does not require any addition, whereas *lā ʿan ʿaḍriba Zaydan* (under

¹⁰ See al-Xalīl, *ʿAyn VIII*, 350, -7.

¹¹ For some examples, see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab II*, 8, 1-2; al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1994) I, 134, -1-135, 1; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 147, 9-10; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 81, 1-3; al-Fārisī, *Ḥalabīyyāt*, 45, 9-11; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 139, 6-8; al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 100, 10-12; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 165, 1-2; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid II*, 1050, 4-5; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ miʿa*, 16, 2-5; al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb XV*, 332b, 1-3; 332b, -4--3; Ibn Fāris, *Muǧmal II*, 790b, 3-4; Ibn Sida, *Muḥkam X*, 361, 5-7.

¹² For grammarians and lexicographers who mention this on the authority of Hišām (perhaps Hišām b. Muʿāwiya), see al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1994) I, 135, 3-6; al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb I*, 240 (cf. al-Kisāʿī, *Maʿānī*, 74, 8-9); al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb XV*, 332b, 8-10; al-Šāḡānī, *Takmilā VI*, 309a, 19-21; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) XVIII, 515b, 18-19.

For others who attribute this opinion to al-Kisāʿī without mentioning Hišām, see al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq) I*, 407; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl II.2*, 15, 4-5; Ibn Hišām, *ʿAwḍaḥ II*, 72, 10; Ibn Hišām, *Muǧnī* (1910) I, 203, -5; Ibn Hišām, *Jāmiʿ*, 169, 4-5; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid III*, 67, -1-68, 1; al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 268, 14; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ III*, 179, 9-10; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ IV*, 93, 15.

¹³ See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab II*, 8, 3-5; al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1994) I, 135, 1-3; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 147, 10-12; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Cairo) I*, 81, 4-6; al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīqā II*, 127, 6-10; al-Fārisī, *Ḥalabīyyāt*, 45, 11-46, 2; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 139, 9-12; al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 100, 12-13; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 165, 3-5; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid II*, 1050, 5-10; al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb XV*, 332b, 4-7.

the assumption that *lan* is derived from *lā+ʿan*) is incomplete: *ʿan* and what follows it are equivalent to one noun (a verbal noun in this case), and *lā* joined to an utterance equivalent to a noun requires a predicate.¹⁴

- b. Some grammarians say that al-Xalīl's view is improbable because it cannot be proved. Unless it can be shown that a word is a compound, it should be treated as independent: a derivation as compound in this case is a *farʿ* 'secondary form', in contrast to the *ʿaṣl*, and the latter is to be preferred.¹⁵
- c. Ibn al-Ḥājjib says that al-Xalīl's explanation contradicts *qiyās*, because the *ʿaṣl* of the *hamza* is not to be omitted.¹⁶ In other words, had *lan* originated from *lā+ʿan* the *hamza* would not be omitted.¹⁷

2.3.3. *Grammarians and lexicographers who support al-Xalīl's opinion*

Some grammarians and lexicographers agree with al-Xalīl's etymology of *lan* and contend that a compound word (here: *lan*) need not behave syntactically as its two components (here: *lā+ʿan*). In other words, such a word does not have to appear in the same syntactic environments as its components. As evidence they point to the word *lawlā* 'unless' or 'if only' (as a synonym of *hallā*), which is syntactically different from its two components *law* and *lā*. Therefore, they claim, the example which Sibawayhi uses in order to refute al-Xalīl's opinion, in which he shows that *lan* is syntactically different from its two components *lā+ʿan*, does not prove that al-Xalīl is wrong.¹⁸

¹⁴ See al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 407. Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 78, note 7 of chapter 233. Some grammarians make the same argument without mentioning al-Sirāfi as its origin. See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1050, -2-1051, 2; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 692, 10-14; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 218, 8-10; al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 286, 5-10.

¹⁵ See Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 202, 13-19; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 14-16; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 33, 1-2; al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 259, 2 last lines; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 15, 9-10; al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 286, 1-2.

¹⁶ See Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 218, 12.

¹⁷ Cf. Aartun's opinion at the beginning of §2.4.2.

¹⁸ For some grammarians who support al-Xalīl's view, see Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* (1990) III, 153, 3-5; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 305, -5-306, -3; Ibn Sida, *Muḥkam* X, 361; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1050, 10-18; 1051, 2-10; al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾij*, 100, 1-2. For others who do not support al-Xalīl's view but mention this argument as a possible support, see al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Cairo)* I, 81, 7-17; al-Fārisī, *Ḥalabīyyāt*, 46, 3-11; al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 100, 13-16; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 165, 6-9; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 202, 12-13; Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʿAsrār*, 130, 8-13; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 17-18; 1166, 19-21; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 33, 4-6; al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 259, 3 last lines; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 243, 10-244, 2; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 37, 4-5; al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 286, 11-14; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1643, 3-4.

2.3.4. *Grammarians and lexicographers who mention al-Xalīl's opinion without taking a position*

In reference to a Qur'ānic verse in which *lan* occurs (Qur'ān 22:47), al-Axfaš mentions the opinion on the relationship between *lan* and *lā+'an*, without attributing it to al-Xalīl (al-Axfaš introduces it with the vague words *waqāla ba'ḍuhum* 'one of them [i.e. the grammarians] said'), and does not express either agreement with or objection to this opinion, merely noting that *wahādā qawlun wakaḍālika jamī'u lan fi l-Qur'āni* 'this is an opinion which [applies to] all [the occurrences of] *lan* in the Qur'ān'. He does, however, point out that if one does accept this opinion, the noun *Zayd* in the sentence *'aZaydun lan taḍriba* 'Will you not hit Zayd?', must be put in the *raf'* case because its meaning is equivalent to *'aZaydun lā ḍarba lahu* 'Is there no hitting of Zayd?'.¹⁹

Ibn Fāris, al-Astarābādī and Abū Ḥayyān also mention the opinion attributed to al-Xalīl without expressing either agreement or objection. Ibn Fāris adds that the meaning of *lā 'an* is *mā ḥadā waqtu 'an yakūna kaḍā* 'this is not the time that such and such will occur'.²⁰

2.4. *Secondary sources*

2.4.1. *Lan is a compound of lā+'an*

Some modern researchers agree with the explanation given by al-Xalīl and other grammarians for the origin of the word *lan* (see §2.3.1 and §2.3.3, respectively).²¹ One of these is Fleischer, who argues that contraction from *lā+'an*, admitted by al-Xalīl and al-Kisā'ī, explains the syntactic behavior of *lan* and its usage as a word of negation denoting an emphatic future.²²

¹⁹ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 301, –1–302, 5.

²⁰ See Ibn Fāris, *Šāḥibī*, 165, 5–6; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 36, 7; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1643, 2–3. See further al-Jāmī, *Šarḥ* II, 239, 3–4; al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāḥ* (1998) I, 212, 7–8.

²¹ See Ewald, *Grammar* I, 349, –4––3 (part of §478); II, 115, 19; de Sacy, *Grammaire* II, 29, 11–13 (part of §62). See further de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 512, 8–9 (part of §1122), where the author claims that *lā 'an*, from which *lan* is derived, is an abbreviation of *lā yakūnu 'an 'il n'arriwera pas que*. Cf. Trumpp, *Einleitung*, 37, 8–10; Wright, *Grammar* I, 287, §362. hh; II, 25, 5–6.

See also Cheikho-Durand, *Elementa*, 136, 8–9 (part of §113); Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 456, §224; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 85, 1 (part of §48.5); 744, 14–16 (part of §242); Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 603 (§395.b.β); Brockelmann, *Grammatik*, 99, 12 (part of §93); Fleisch, *Arabe*, 201, note 1; Fischer, *Grammatik*, 97 = Fischer, *Grammatik (translation)*, 109, §196c; Ba'albakī, *Dirāsāt*, 34, –4––3 and note 2; Lipiński, *Grammar*, 358, 2 (part of §39.17); 456, 18–20 (part of §47.10).

²² See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 536, –2–537, 2.

The first part of this argument can be accepted, but it is not clear how this etymology proves *lan*'s apparent emphatic power (see §4.3).

2.4.1.1. *Lan is made up of lā+'an, originally *lā-han* Lipiński also contends that the etymological origin of *lan* is *lā+'an*, but adds that the origin of this *'an* is the word *han*, which has a presentative function.²³ Lipiński does not provide any proof, although his explanation may be related to a usage of *'an* with a presentative function, viz. introducing direct speech, an elucidation or an explanation, this *'an* being referred to by the grammarians as *'an al-mufasssira* 'the elucidating *'an*' (see chapter 1, §1.1-b). According to Aartun, too (see §2.4.2 below), one of the elements comprising *lan* is the emphatic particle *-n* which has a presentative function (deictic, in Aartun's words).²⁴ However, Aartun totally rejects the view that this emphatic particle originates from *'an*.

2.4.2. *Lan is made up of the base lā and the emphatic particle -n*

In 1976 Aartun wrote a short article aiming at investigating the etymological origin of *lan* (Aartun, *Lan*). At the beginning of this article he mentions the common opinion among modern researchers, that *lan* is derived from *lā+'an*.²⁵ As explained in §2.3 and especially in §2.3.1 and §2.3.3, this is also the view of some grammarians, but throughout his article Aartun does not refer to their opinions.

According to Aartun this etymological explanation is phonetically and syntactically untenable. Phonetically, in all the phases of Arabic *hamza* has been retained following a long *ā*, and therefore it is quite unlikely that *lan* is a contraction of *lā+'an*, from which the *hamza* is omitted following *ā*. Aartun records a few examples of phonetically similar compounds in which the *hamza* is retained: *lawlā 'an*, *'ilā 'an* and *lammā 'an*. Syntactically, Aartun argues, except for the common combination of *lan* followed by a *manṣūb* verb, there is reliable evidence for *lan* followed by a *majzūm* verb (see §3.3.2 and the end of §3.4). In addition, there are occurrences of *lan* following *'an*, as Reckendorf shows.²⁶

²³ See Lipiński, *Grammar*, 456, 18–20 (part of §47.10). Lipiński subsequently explains (*ibid.*, 472, §§49.5–49.6) that the word *han* is found in a few words in various Semitic languages, which clearly have a presentative function, such as *hinne* and *'inna*, in Hebrew and Arabic, respectively.

²⁴ See Aartun, *Subjunctive*, 313, –4.

²⁵ See Aartun, *Lan*, 187, 2 first paragraphs, where the author cites Reckendorf, Wright and Brockelmann. For their views, as well as those of other modern researchers, see §2.4.1.

²⁶ See Aartun, *Lan*, 187–188, where Aartun refers to Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 126 and 454.

In Aartun's opinion, the above-mentioned phonetic and syntactic arguments prove that *lan*, unlike *lā* and other negation particles, developed independently of any specific syntactic structure. It can be thus inferred, he argues, that *lan* is a compound made up of the base *lā* and the emphatic particle *-n*. A similar process led to the creation of additional words, such as the particles *lam* (base *lā* and emphatic particle *-m*) and *'idan* (base *'idā* and emphatic particle *-n*).²⁷ Aartun then mentions additional examples from other Semitic languages, such as Ancient South Arabic, Aramaic and Ugaritic. He contends that in the historical process of language development the forms ending with the emphatic particles *-n/-m*, such as *lan* and *lam*, were conceived as independent units in contrast to their counterparts which lacked these particles (in the case of both *lan* and *lam* this is the negative particle *lā*). Only later they began occurring only in certain syntactic contexts: *lan* followed by a *maṣṣūb* and *lam* by a *majzūm* verb. Although this tendency became common in the language, the evidence for *lan* not followed by a *maṣṣūb* (but rather a *majzūm*) verb and of *lam* not followed by a *majzūm* (but rather a *marfū'* or a *maṣṣūb*) verb proves, in Aartun's opinion, that the use of these particles was completely context-free, i.e. that *lan* and *lam* did not necessitate *naṣb* and *jazm*, respectively.²⁸

Aartun's etymological explanation for the creation of *lan* is probably more reasonable than the assumption of a contraction of *lā+ʿan*. However, the claim that in an early phase of the language the use of *lan*, as well as of *lam*, was completely context-free is quite far-fetched, considering the numerous pieces of evidence of a syntactic context for each of the particles (*lan* followed by a *maṣṣūb* and *lam* by a *majzūm* verb) and the very scant evidence for other syntactic contexts in which these particles occur.

2.4.3. *Lan is an independent word not derived from several elements*

Most grammarians, beginning with Sībawayhi, hold this opinion (see §2.1 and §2.3.2) about the etymology of *lan*, which is shared by only a minority of modern scholars. Among the latter is Ḥasan, who contends that *lan* is an independent word, not compounded of several elements, and rejects the view that it is derived from *lā+ʿan* as incorrect.²⁹ Qaddāra is another

²⁷ For Aartun's opinion on *'idan*, see chapter 4, §4.4.5.

²⁸ See Aartun, *Lan*, 188–189.

²⁹ See Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 299, note 1.

researcher who supports this opinion, after mentioning the main opinions of traditional grammarians.³⁰

3. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING *LAN*

3.1. *Sībawayhi*

In all of his discussions of *lan*, Sībawayhi does not explicitly refer to the mood of the following verb, because according to him it is always *naṣb*. The best evidence that the *naṣb* mood for him is the only possibility is the series of examples he adduces for this mood in chapter 2 of his *Kitāb*, using this particle (see §1.1-a for details and note 1 for the reference).

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, does not refer to the mood of *lan*. From his commentaries on Qur'ānic verses in which *lan* occurs, it can be inferred that this mood is always *naṣb*.

3.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians do not discuss the mood of the verb following *lan*, since in their view it is clearly always *manṣūb* (see §3.3.1 below). Some mention that it may also occur in *jazm*, but only as a dialectal phenomenon which characterizes a minority of speakers (see §3.3.2). Only one grammarian, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, indicates that *raf'* is possible, too (see §3.3.3). The mood of the verb following *lan* is also discussed with regards to the view that the syntactic effect of *lan* on this verb contradicts the *qiyās* (see §3.3.4).

3.3.1. *The common opinion: the verb following lan is always manṣūb*

3.3.1.1. *Lan always and unconditionally induces the following verb to take naṣb* This view is shared by most grammarians. In their discussions of the four particles which directly induce the following verb to take *naṣb* (*'an*, *lan*, *kay* and *'iḍan*), some later grammarians contend that the verb following *lan* and *kay* is always *manṣūb*, whereas *'an* and *'iḍan* do not

³⁰ See Qaddāra, *Masā'il*, 44–46.

necessarily induce *naṣb*.³¹ According to Ibn Hišām, *lan* is the only one of the four following which the verb is necessarily *manṣūb*.³²

3.3.1.2. *Lan induces the following verb to take naṣb due to its resemblance to 'an* According to some grammarians the syntactic effect of *lan* is due to its resemblance to *'an*. However, only some explain wherein this resemblance lies.

In his commentary on a Qur'ānic verse in which *lan* occurs (Qur'ān 22:47), al-Axfaš notes that *lan* causes *naṣb* in the same way as *'an*,³³ but does not explain how the two particles are alike.³⁴ Perhaps his comment is related to his acceptance of the etymological explanation of *lan* as a compound of *lā+ 'an*, which he subsequently mentions as possible in his discussion of this verse (see §2.3.4).

Other grammarians, for example al-Sirāfi and Ibn Ya'īš, argue that *lan* and *'an* are similar in two respects: both induce the following verb to take *naṣb* and the verb denotes an action in the future.³⁵ Al-Rummānī, on the other hand, contends that the two particles are alike in their pronunciation.³⁶ Some grammarians mention all the above-mentioned similarities.³⁷

3.3.2. Evidence for *lan* followed by a verb in *jazm*

Some speakers of Arabic are said to have put the verb following *lan* in *jazm* and not in *naṣb* as detailed below.

Ibn Šuqayr briefly mentions the possibility of putting the verb following *lan wa'axawātuhā* in *jazm*, as in *lan yukrimka* 'he will not honor you' and *lan 'uxrijka* 'I will not expel you'.³⁸ By *lan wa'axawātuhā* he refers to the particles after which the verb normally takes *naṣb*, and indeed he subsequently cites two lines of poetry in which the verbs following *lām kay* (in the first) and following *'an* (in the second) take *jazm* and not

³¹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 330, 8–9; al-Šan'ānī, *Tahdīb*, 243, 10.

³² See Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 259, 10.

³³ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 301, –1–302, 1.

³⁴ For other grammarians who mention the resemblance of *lan* to *'an* without any further elucidation, see al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 139, 6; Ibn Abī Rabī', *Kāfi* II, 238, 2.

³⁵ See al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Cairo)* I, 80, 3 last lines; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 12; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 32, 4–7; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 358, 7. Cf. §4.3 and especially note 65 for references to other grammarians holding the view that the verb following *lan* denotes a future time.

³⁶ See al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 100, 9. Cf. al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 244, 4, where the author mentions this opinion and attributes it to Sibawayhi.

³⁷ See al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 259, 5–7; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taḥlīl* II.2, 14, 6–8.

³⁸ See Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 184, 2.

naṣb, as expected (these verses are cited and discussed in chapter 9, §6.3 and chapter 1, §2.3.2.1-a, respectively). Al-Naḥḥās, a contemporary of Ibn Ṣuqayr, states that some speakers put the verb following *lan* in *jazm* and the verb following *lam* in *naṣb*.³⁹

Ibn Sīda, in his discussion of the particles followed by a *majzūm* verb, mentions corroborating evidence for what al-Naḥḥās reports, on the authority of Abū ‘Ubayda. Ibn Sīda adds that if this information is correct, one should add *lan* to the group of particles inducing the following verb to take *jazm*.⁴⁰

Ibn al-Anbārī also mentions the possibility of a *majzūm* verb following *lan*.⁴¹ In his *Luma‘* he discusses the phenomenon of *naql* in the sense of ‘transmission of eloquent Arabic speech’. Cases that deviate from ‘eloquent Arabic speech’ should not be transmitted. These are either utterances by non-Bedouins, such as the *muwalladūna*,⁴² or *mā jā’a šāddan fī kalāmihim* ‘what occurs as exceptional [examples] in their (i.e. the Bedouins’) speech’. As for the latter type, Ibn al-Anbārī mentions that a *majzūm* verb may follow *lan* and a *manṣūb* verb may follow *lam*. He adds that al-Liḥyānī reported this exceptional usage, citing a Qur’ānic verse in which the verb following *lam* takes *naṣb*: ‘*alam našraḥa laka šadraka* ‘did we not relieve your heart (literally: expand thy breast)?’ (Qur’ān 94:1).⁴³ It should be noted that Ibn al-Anbārī provides no example for *lan* followed by a *majzūm* verb and merely mentions this possibility in his *Luma‘*. In his other books, including *‘Asrār*, in which he provides an extensive treatment of moods, there is no mention of this.⁴⁴

Al-Suhaylī contends that *lan* should have caused the following verb to be *majzūm* and not *manṣūb*. In his view, since this particle negates

³⁹ See Mus‘id, *Naḥw*, 96, 9, where the author quotes al-Naḥḥās from his *Šarḥ ‘abyāt Sibawayhi*.

⁴⁰ See Ibn Sīda, *Muxaṣṣaṣ* XIV, 45, –1–46, 2. Cf. al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) IX, 5954a, 5–6; al-Šan‘ānī, *Tahḏīb*, 243, 11–12.

⁴¹ For the whole discussion, see Ibn al-Anbārī, *Luma‘* (1963), 28, –3–30, 1.

⁴² These are new speakers of the language, such as poets of a late period. For a discussion of the term *muwalladūna*, see Ibn al-Anbārī, *Luma‘* (1963), 28–29, note 1.

⁴³ For later grammarians who mention al-Liḥyānī as reporting exceptional occurrences of *naṣb* following *lam*, see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1643, 7–8; 1861, 3; al-‘Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 448, 3–4; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 239, –4–2; al-Suyūṭī, *‘Itqān* (1901), 173, –10; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham‘* IV, 97, 4; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* II, 1915a, 2 last lines.

As for this Qur’ānic verse, the regular *qirā’a* of the verb here is *našraḥ* in *jazm*. Other explanations have been given for the exceptional version *našraḥa*, beside the one that treats it as *manṣūb*. For a summary of these solutions, see Ibn al-Anbārī, *Luma‘* (1957), second part of note 1.

⁴⁴ For his extensive discussion of *naṣb* and *jazm*, see Ibn al-Anbārī, *‘Asrār*, 129, 15–132, 21.

the verb, it should have also negated its *'i'rāb*, by causing its last consonant to be pronounced with a *sukūn* (no vowel), i.e. by causing it to take *jazm* and so bringing meaning and form into accord. Al-Suhaylī adds that some speakers indeed pronounced the verb following *lan* in *jazm*, but the majority put the verb in *naṣb*. He explains the *naṣb* mood as resulting from the *'an* that forms part of *lan* (al-Suhaylī is one of the grammarians who explain *lan* as derived from *lā+ 'an*; see §2.3.3).⁴⁵

Ibn Mālik discusses the possibility of *jazm* following *lan* in his commentary on a Ḥadīṭ in which it is related that 'Abdallāh b. 'Umar was told in his sleep *lan tura' lan tura'* 'you will not be startled, you will not be startled'. This Ḥadīṭ has two other versions, in which the sentence has the forms *lam tura'* and *lan turā'a*, but Ibn Mālik does not mention them.⁴⁶ Ibn Mālik gives two possible explanations of the form *lan tura'*. The first (and less likely) explanation is that the verb was originally *manṣūb*, i.e. *turā'a*, but since it was pronounced in *waqf* 'pausal form', the resulting word **turā'* was shortened to *tura'* in order to avoid the impossible sequence of a *sukūn* following a long vowel. The second explanation is that the Ḥadīṭ was said in a dialect in which speakers put the verb following *lan* in *jazm*. Ibn Mālik concludes with the comment that the information on this dialect is due to al-Kisā'ī.⁴⁷

Ibn Hišām and other later grammarians mention the occurrence of a *majzūm* verb after *lan* in two lines of poetry:⁴⁸ *'ayādī sabā yā 'Azza mā kuntu ba'dakum / falan yaḥla lil-'aynayni ba'daki manẓaru* 'scattered all around, 'Azza, I was after your departure (literally: after you), and after you no view is good for the eyes';⁴⁹ *lan yaxibi l-āna min rajā'ika man / ḥarraka min dūni bābika l-ḥalqah* 'whoever moves the metal ring in front

⁴⁵ See al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*, 100, 4–11.

⁴⁶ See Ibn Mālik, *Šawāhid*, 215, 5 and note 1069.

⁴⁷ See Ibn Mālik, *Šawāhid*, 217, 1–9. Nöldeke cites this Ḥadīṭ with the versions *lam tura'* and *lan tura'*. He accepts the sources that report the latter form as reliable, and states that it perhaps reflects a phonetic shift from *lam tura'*. See Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 67, note 4 (part of §55). Cf. Ullmann, *WKAS* II.3, 1449b, 39–1550a, 8, where the Ḥadīṭ is cited in several versions based on different sources.

⁴⁸ See Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 204, 11–13 (cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāḥ* (1998) I, 298, 6, where Ibn Hišām is quoted); al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 180, 3–4; 181, 1–2; Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 929, 1–4; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* II, 1921b, 5–7. Cf. Ullmann, *WKAS* II.3, 1550a, 8–19.

For grammarians and lexicographers who cite only the first verse, see al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 288, 1–4; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 272, 5–7; al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 268, 21; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) XVIII, 516a, 10–12. For modern scholars who discuss this verse, see Kosegarten, *Grammatica*, 574, 3–5 (part of §1228), who relies on al-Firūzābādī; Freytag, *Lexicon* IV, 128b, 6–8.

⁴⁹ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Kuṭayyir 'Azza.

of your door (i.e. the ring pulled by visitors) will not be disappointed now from your desire'.⁵⁰ Ibn Hišām says that it is possible that the verbal form *yaḥla* (allegedly in *jazm*) was shortened from the *manṣūb* form *yaḥlā* due to poetic license.⁵¹ The same can be said of the second verse, too.

3.3.3. Evidence for *lan* followed by a verb in *raf*

Of all the grammarians and lexicographers whose books I have examined, only Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya says that there are speakers who put the verb following *lan* in *raf*. He adds that according to al-Farrā' this is as rare as *jazm* in the same context.⁵² He does not adduce any example for *raf* following *lan*.

3.3.4. The opinion that the syntactic effect of *lan* on the following verb is a deviation from the *qiyās*

Al-Fārisī states that Abū 'Uṭmān (al-Māzinī) considered the syntactic effect of *lan* a deviation from the *qiyās*, because the negative utterance with *lan* and its positive equivalent, i.e. *lan yaḥ'ala* vis-à-vis *sayaf'alu/sawfa yaḥ'alu* (see §4), were not in accordance. In the negative utterance the particle *lan* has a syntactic effect on the following verb, whereas in the positive utterance the particle *sa-* (or *sawfa*) has no such effect.⁵³

3.4. Secondary sources

Modern studies rarely discuss the mood of the verb following *lan*, since the common opinion is that it is always *naṣb*.⁵⁴ Some do mention the possibility of a *majzūm* verb in this context and cite a line of poetry and a Ḥadīṭ as evidence (the first of the two lines of poetry and the Ḥadīṭ mentioned and explained towards the end of §3.3.2).⁵⁵

Lipiński indicates that in a few dialects *jazm* was used following the particles '*an*, *lan* and *law*. Although he does not provide any example

⁵⁰ The author of this verse, in the *munsariḥ* meter, is unknown. According to al-Suyūṭī, it was an Arab who said this verse near the house door of al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. For an explanation of the verse and the context in which it was said, see al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1966) II, 684–689.

⁵¹ See Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 204, 14. Cf. al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 288, 5–11; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 272, 8–9.

⁵² See Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Iršād* II, 350, 13–14.

⁵³ See al-Fārisī, *Baṣṛiyyāt* I, 446, 10–14.

⁵⁴ For numerous examples taken from different corpora in which *lan* is followed by a *manṣūb* verb, see Ullmann, *WKAS* II.3, 1446–1450.

⁵⁵ For references of sources citing the verse and the Ḥadīṭ, see notes 48 and 47 above, respectively.

he comes to the far-fetched conclusion that the dialects in question did not use *naṣb* or *rafʿ*.⁵⁶ Rabin, unlike Lipiński, does quote some instances in which *lan* is followed by a *majzūm* verb in his discussion of similar instances with *ʿan* (see chapter 1, §2.4.1.2-a). Rabin hypothesizes that these dialects had no *manṣūb* forms at all and that the *jazm* mood was thus used in subordinate clauses, as in Ethiopic.⁵⁷

4. THE UTTERANCE *LAN YAFʿALA* IS A NEGATION OF THE UTTERANCE *SAYAFʿALU/SAWFA YAFʿALU*

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

In a few chapters of his *Kitāb* Sībawayhi emphasizes that the utterance *lan yafʿala* is the negative equivalent of *sayafʿalu/sawfa yafʿalu*. From this equivalence it can be inferred that *lan* negates an occurrence of an action in a future time relative to the time of speech, since it negates *sayafʿalu/sawfa yafʿalu* which expresses an occurrence at such a time. Here are Sībawayhi's references to the relationship between these two utterances, in order of appearance in the *Kitāb*:

- a. In chapter 32 Sībawayhi discusses interrogative utterances introduced by a *marfūʿ* noun and not by an interrogative particle. In reference to negative utterances and their positive equivalents, he contends that *lan ʿadriba* 'I will not hit' is the negation of *saʿadribu* 'I will hit'.⁵⁸
- b. In chapter 234, devoted to *ʿan muḍmara*, Sībawayhi says that *lan yafʿala* 'he will not do [something]' is the negation of *sayafʿalu* 'he will do [something]'.⁵⁹
- c. In chapter 508, in which various nouns and particles are briefly defined, Sībawayhi defines *lan* in the following words: *walan wahiya naḥḥun liqawlihi sayafʿalu* '*lan* is the negation of *sayafʿalu*'.⁶⁰ Elsewhere in the same chapter he refers to the prefix *sa-* and says *zaʿama l-Xalil ʿannahā*

⁵⁶ See Lipiński, *Grammar*, 358, §39.17.

⁵⁷ See Rabin, *West-Arabian*, 186–187, §nn. For his brief discussion of *lan*, see *ibid.*, 187, 12–14.

⁵⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 57, 1–4.

⁵⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 22–23. Cf. *ibid.*, 409, 4 (part of chapter 259 devoted to negation), where the pair is *lan yafʿala: sawfa yafʿalu*.

⁶⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* II, 332, 20.

jawābu lan yaf'ala ‘al-Xalīl contended that it (i.e. the prefix *sa-*) is a *jawāb* of *lan yaf'ala* ‘he will not do [something]’”.⁶¹

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

According to al-Ṣāḡānī, al-Farrā' considers *lan* a particle that negates only verbs that denote an action in the future, whereas *lā* negates verbs denoting all three possible times (in his words: *al-māḍī wal-mustaqbal wal-dā'im* ‘past, future and present [literally: lasting, continuous]’) and also nouns (i.e. as *lā l-nāfiya lil-jins*). The fact that *lan* is used only in some of the contexts in which *lā* is used proves his claim that the latter is the ‘aṣl of the former.⁶²

4.3. *Other grammarians*

The vast majority of grammarians (and modern scholars as well) agrees with Sibawayhi's view that *lan yaf'ala* is the negation of *sayaf'alu*.⁶³ One exception is al-Suyūṭī, who argues that *lan yaf'ala* is a negation of ‘*innī 'af'alu* ‘indeed I will do [something]’.⁶⁴

The time which the verb negated by *lan* denotes, according to the grammarians and lexicographers, is the future.⁶⁵

⁶¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* II, 331, 9–10.

⁶² See al-Ṣāḡānī, *Takmilā* VI, 309b, 14–16.

⁶³ See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* I, 47, 4–7; II, 6, 8–9; al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1994) I, 134, 14; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 147, 8–9; 206, –4; 233, –1; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 80, –4–3; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 100, 8; al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 332a, –4–3; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 262, –4–3; Ibn Fāris, *Šāḥibī*, 165, 4–5; Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 341, 9; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 146, 4–7; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1050, 1–2; Ibn Sīda, *Muḥkam* X, 361, 5; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 759, –3–2; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 310, 5–7; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 148, 19–20; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) IX, 5954a, 2–3; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 9–10; 1199, 17.

Lipiński exceptionally denies that *lan yaf'ala* is the negative equivalent *sayaf'alu* (Lipiński, *Grammar*, 352, 15–19 (part of §39.5)). Unlike most secondary sources, Lipiński argues that the utterance introduced by *lan* should not be considered a negation of the indicative *sayaf'alu*, but rather an utterance denoting the speaker's disbelief that the relevant action will occur in reality. Lipiński does not elaborate on this idea, but in view of what he says at the beginning of §39.5, namely that *naṣb* must always reflect a wish, an expectation, a goal or a result, and never an indicative utterance, it can be inferred that this is the basis for his opinion on *lan*, too.

⁶⁴ See al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān* (1901), 174, 8–9.

⁶⁵ See, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Hurūf*, 8, 1; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 80, 3 last lines; al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 332a, 7; al-Fārisī, *Idāḥ* II, 1049, 8; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 100, 7–8; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 262, 2 last lines; Ibn Fāris, *Muḥkam* II, 790b, 3; Ibn Fāris, *Šāḥibī*, 165, 4; al-Jawhārī, *Tāj* II, 408, 17; Ibn Sīda, *Muxaṣṣaṣ* XIV, 55, 2; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 146, 4; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1050, 1–4; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) IX, 5954a, 5; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 1198, 17.

Grammarians have made various claims and expressed different views on the nature of negation with *lan*. These will be presented in the following sections.

4.3.1. *Negation with lan is stronger than with lā*

Al-Xalīl argues that *lan* is similar to *lā*, but adds that the former is more emphatic. His example is the sentence *lan yukrimaka Zaydun* 'Zayd will not honor you'; this would be said to a person who very much desires that Zayd honor him, using the negation with *lan* to convey greater emphasis than a sentence with *lā* would have expressed.⁶⁶ Al-Jurjānī, al-Zamaxšarī and Ibn al-Xabbāz express a similar opinion, claiming that the negation using *lan* is always stronger than with *lā*. As proof al-Zamaxšarī adduces two similar Qur'ānic verses in which the verbs are negated by *lā* and *lan*, respectively, claiming that the negation in the latter is stronger than that in the former. The verses are *lā 'abrahu ḥattā 'abluḡa majma'a l-baḥrayni 'aw 'amḏiya ḥuquban* 'I will not give up until my arrival to the meeting place of the two seas, though I go on for many years' (Qur'ān 18:60) and *falan 'abraha l-'arḍa ḥattā ya'dana lī 'abī* 'I will not leave the land, until my father gives me leave' (Qur'ān 12:80).⁶⁷

Some of the grammarians who attribute to *lan* a more emphatic negation than to *lā* contend that negation with *lan* necessarily conveys *ta'bīd waṭūl al-mudda* 'perpetuality and an (extended) period of time'. Not all agree; there are in fact some that not only deny that negation with *lan* conveys *ta'bīd*, but to the contrary, claim that it denotes a time span which is not long. It is quite possible that this dispute has its roots in two different versions of the relevant passage in different manuscripts of al-Zamaxšarī's *'Unmūdaj*, one that attributes to *lan* a meaning of *ta'kid* 'emphasis' and the other of *ta'bīd* 'perpetuality' (see the end of §4.3.1.1 below).

4.3.1.1. *The strong negation with lan denotes ta'bīd waṭūl al-mudda* Ibn Ya'īš agrees with al-Zamaxšarī that negation with *lan* is stronger than with *lā*, but adds that *lan* negates an action for a long time.⁶⁸ According to Ibn

⁶⁶ See al-Xalīl, *'Ayn VIII*, 350, 7–4. Cf. al-Azharī, *Tahḏīb XV*, 332b, –3–333a, 2, where the author quotes al-Xalīl.

⁶⁷ See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 146, 8–9; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ mi'a*, 16, 1–2; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaššal*, 143, 7–9; al-Zamaxšarī, *'Unmūdaj*, 109, 1 and his commentator al-Ardabīlī, *Šarḥ*, 109, 1–3; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 358, 2–3; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ I*, 160, –1–161, 1; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ II*, 218, 4–6. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān (1901)*, 174, 7–8, where the author attributes the above-mentioned opinion to al-Zamaxšarī and Ibn al-Xabbāz.

⁶⁸ For the whole discussion, see Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ II*, 1165, 3–1166, 6.

Ya'īš, *lan yaf'ala* is the negation of *sayaf'alu* (see the beginning of §4.3), and just as the particles *sa-* and *sawfa* convey *tanfīs* 'amplification',⁶⁹ so does the equivalent negation with *lan* denote *ta'bīd waṭūl al-mudda*. In order to prove his point Ibn Ya'īš cites a Qur'ānic verse and a line of poetry in which the word '*abad* 'perpetuality' follows *lan* and, so he claims, emphasizes the meaning of perpetual negation which *lan* conveys. The Qur'ānic verse is *walan yatamannawhu 'abadan bimā qaddamat 'aydihim* 'but they will never long for it (i.e. death), because what their hands have forwarded' (Qur'an 2:95) and the line of poetry is *falan yurāji'a qalbī ḥubbahā 'abadan / zakintu min buḡḍihim mitla llaḍi zakinū* 'my heart will never turn away on her love. I understood from their hate, as they did'.⁷⁰

It is interesting to note that many later grammarians attribute to al-Zamaxšārī in his '*Unmūdaj* the claim that *lan* conveys *ta'bīd*.⁷¹ In fact, al-Zamaxšārī speaks of the meaning of *ta'kīd* conveyed by *lan* (see §4.3.1), but it is noted that some manuscripts have the version *ta'bīd* instead of *ta'kīd*,⁷² apparently a copying error caused by the similar orthography of these two words. In view of al-Zamaxšārī's explicit view as expressed in his other books, especially *Mufaṣṣal*, it can be inferred that he indeed attributes to *lan* a meaning of *ta'kīd*, but not that of *ta'bīd*. This is also Fleischer's view, who relies on the sole occurrences of *ta'kīd* (and not *ta'bīd*) in Broch's edition of '*Unmūdaj* as well as in other sources.⁷³ It seems probable that the copying error discussed above gave rise to the grammarians' dispute on the relationship between *lan* and the meaning of *ta'bīd* (also described in the following section).

4.3.1.2. *The strong negation with lan does not denote ta'bīd* Commenting on al-Zamaxšārī's words on *lan*, al-Saxāwī admits that negation with *lan* has a meaning of *ta'kīd*, as al-Zamaxšārī says, but adds that it is not an absolute negation, that it does not imply that the action will never take place. Otherwise a temporally restricted sentence with *lan* such as

⁶⁹ This is Lane's translation of this term in reference to the particles *sa-* and *sawfa*. Lane cites Ibn Hišām's *Muḡnī*, in which it is claimed that these particles change the time the imperfect verb denotes from the limited present to the amplified future. See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2826c, 4–9.

⁷⁰ A verse in the *baṣīṭ* meter, by Qa'nab b. Umm Šāhib.

⁷¹ See, for example, Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 115, –5–4; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 14, 10; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 204, 1–2; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 58, 3–4; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 66, –3–2; al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 179, 7–8; al-Azharī, *Taṣrīḥ* II, 357, 15; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham* IV, 94, 11.

⁷² See al-Ardabīlī, *Šarḥ*, 109, 1–3.

⁷³ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 537, 7–14.

lan 'aqūma yawma l-xamīsi 'I will not rise on Thursday' would not have been possible. Al-Saxāwī maintains that negation with *lan* conveys more emphasis than with *lā*. This can be inferred from the following example: if someone says *lā 'af'alu kadā* 'I will not do so-and-so' and receives the response *lā budda laka min fī'lihi* 'it is necessary for you to do it', he can emphasize his refusal by saying *lan 'af'alahu* 'I will definitely not do it'.⁷⁴

Other grammarians who hold the same view prove that intensive negation with *lan* does not convey *ta'bīd* with two Qur'ānic verses in which this negation is restricted to a certain time defined by a subordinate clause introduced by *hattā*. The first is Qur'ān 12:80, cited and explained in §4.3.1 above; and the second is *qālū lan nabraḥa 'alayhi 'ākifīna hattā yarji'a 'ilaynā Mūsā* 'they said: we will not cease to cleave to it (i.e. the golden calf), until Moses returns to us' (Qur'ān 20:91).⁷⁵

4.3.1.3. *Lan negates a verb denoting temporally proximate action that is neither continuous nor long, in contrast to lā* Some grammarians who reject the view presented in §4.3.1.1 above even insist that the opposite is the case: not only does negation with *lan* not denote *ta'bīd*, but on the contrary, it denotes negation only for a short and non-continuous time. Al-Suhaylī, who holds this view, alleges that *lan* and *lā* differ in two aspects: *lan* negates verbs which denote a temporally proximate occurrence, and one that is not as continuous as denoted by negation with *lā*. Al-Suhaylī argues for a relationship between the form of the negative particle and its meaning: *lan* ends with a consonant, so that its pronunciation stops and is not continuous, whereas *lā* ends with a vowel, so that its pronunciation is long and continuous. Similarly, *lan* negates non-continuous time, in contrast to *lā*. Al-Suhaylī concludes with two almost identical Qur'ānic verses in which *lan* and *lā* are used, respectively. He claims that the different contexts of the verses show that in the former verse the negation has a specific meaning of a specific near time, whereas in the latter the negation is general and undefined. The two verses are Qur'ān 2:95, cited in a different context in §4.3.1.1, and the almost identical verse in which *lā* is employed: *lā yatamannawnahu 'abadan bimā qaddamat 'aydihim*

⁷⁴ See al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 242, 11–243, 1.

⁷⁵ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 36, 4–5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 115, –5–2; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 229, 10; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 14, 12–14; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Iršād* II, 350, 15–16; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 66, 10–14; al-Jāmī, *Šarḥ* II, 242, 2–5; al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*, 791b, –2–792a, 5.

‘they will never long for it (i.e. death), because what their hands have forwarded’ (Qur’ān 62:7).⁷⁶

4.3.2. *The negation with lan is not stronger than with lā*

Ibn ‘Uṣfūr is quoted as saying that according to Sībawayhi and most grammarians negation with *lan* is not stronger than with *lā*, contrary to the opinion introduced in §4.3.1 above. Ibn ‘Uṣfūr insists that negation with *lā* can be even more emphatic than with *lan*. His evidence comes from *jawāb al-qasam*, the utterance following an oath. He argues that the negation of *jawāb al-qasam* must be stronger than the negation of other kinds of utterances, and that therefore the fact that *lā* can introduce this utterance whereas *lan* cannot proves that the former negates more strongly than the latter.⁷⁷ In addition, Ibn ‘Uṣfūr also objects to the opinion introduced in §4.3.1.1 above, which he calls *da‘wā min bāb al-xayālāt* ‘an imaginary claim’ and argues that both *lan* and *lā* can convey a continuous or a non-continuous negation. In order to show that negation using *lan* can be either non-continuous or continuous, two Qur’ānic verses are cited: *falan ‘ukallima l-yawma ‘insiyyan* ‘I will not speak today to any man’ (Qur’ān 19:26), where the negation is clearly non-continuous due to the adverbial accusative of time *al-yawma*,⁷⁸ and *‘innahum lan yuḡnū ‘anka mina llāhi šay’an* ‘they will not avail you at all against God’ (Qur’ān 45:19), where the negation is continuous and not restricted.⁷⁹

Ibn Hišām and later grammarians agree with Ibn ‘Uṣfūr in rejecting the idea that negation with *lan* is stronger than with *lā* and that it

⁷⁶ See al-Suhaylī, *Natā’ij*, 100, 16–101, 6. Cf. al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 260, 5–13; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1643, 3 last lines.

⁷⁷ Al-Sāmarrā’ī rejects Ibn ‘Uṣfūr’s position, which he refutes with several arguments. He shows, for example, that the fact that a certain utterance can introduce the *jawāb al-qasam* does not make it stronger or more emphatic; the particle *inna*, for example, indisputably conveys emphasis, but cannot introduce this utterance. See al-Sāmarrā’ī, *Ma‘āni* III, 366, 11–367, 6.

⁷⁸ This verse combines *lan*, a particle that according to the grammarians and modern researchers negates an action in the future, with *al-yawma*, an adverbial accusative denoting the present. The way to resolve this apparent contradiction is to take *lan* here as negating an action in the present which continues into the future. This is also the opinion of Ḥasan (Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 299, 2–4; 299, 10–11) who cites this verse in order to show that a verb negated by *lan* usually, but not always, denotes the future.

⁷⁹ For the grammarians who cite this opinion attributed to Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1644, 2–5; Ibn ‘Aqīl, *Musā’id* III, 67, 2–6; al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāḥ* (1998) III, 17, 10–18, 11. Cf. al-Kaffawī, *Kulliyāt*, 966b, 5–10, where the author mentions this opinion without explicitly mentioning Ibn ‘Uṣfūr by name.

denotes *ta'bīd* (these views are introduced in §4.3.1 and §4.3.1.1 above, respectively).⁸⁰

5. THE SEPARATION BETWEEN *lan* AND THE FOLLOWING VERB

5.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi briefly refers to this issue in chapter 257, in which he treats particles which are always followed by verbs. In reference to the two contrasting utterances *sayaf'alu* and *lan yaf'ala*, he argues that the particles *sa-* and *lan* should not be separated from the following verbs.⁸¹

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not explicitly refer to this issue, but some grammarians attribute to him the opinion that a separation between *lan* and the following verb is possible under certain conditions (see §5.3 below).

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians maintain that *lan* and the following verb should not be separated.⁸² Ibn Jinnī, Ibn 'Uṣfūr and Abū Ḥayyān, however, cite a line of poetry which they believe presents evidence for such a separation. The verse is *lammā ra'aytu 'Abā Yazīda muqātilan / 'ada'a l-qitāla wa'aṣhada l-hayjā'a* 'as long as I see that Abū Yazīd fights, I will not cease to fight or take part in the battle'.⁸³ Ibn Jinnī says that the word *lammā* which introduces the verse is derived from *lan mā*,⁸⁴ so that the meaning is *lan 'ada'a l-qitāla wa'aṣhada l-hayjā'a mā ra'aytu 'Abā Yazīda muqātilan* (the translation above is according to this analysis). He emphasizes that such a separation

⁸⁰ See Ibn Hišām, *'Awḍaḥ* II, 72, 8–9; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 204, 1–2; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 58, 3–6; Ibn Hišām, *Jāmi'*, 169, 6. Cf. al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 268, 15; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 179, 7–8; al-Azharī, *Taṣrīḥ* II, 357, 10–23; al-Zabidī, *Tāj* (1994) XVIII, 515b, 20–21.

⁸¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 407, 20–408, 1.

⁸² See, for example, al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* I, 121, –8–5; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 759, 3 last lines; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 62, 1–3; al-Šan'anī, *Tahdīb*, 243, 10–11; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 96, 11–14.

⁸³ The author of this verse, in the *kāmil* meter, is unknown.

⁸⁴ Some later grammarians even cite the verse with the version *lan mā* instead of *lammā*. See Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Ḍarā'ir*, 201, 8; Abū Ḥayyān, *Tadrib*, 195, –3; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1644, 11; V, 2431, –4; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 65, 8. This is also the version in Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 300, 3.

ration is possible as poetic license and tries to explain the logic behind it.⁸⁵ Ibn 'Uşfür and Abū Ḥayyān also say that this separation is only possible due to poetic license. Abū Ḥayyān states that this view is Başran, whereas al-Kisā'ī and al-Farrā' allow a separation between *lan* and the following verb, for example by an oath, as in *lan wallāhi 'ukrima Zaydan* 'I will not, by God, honor Zayd'. Abū Ḥayyān adds that al-Kisā'ī allowed a separation also by a noun syntactically affected by the verb following *lan*, such as the direct object *Zaydan* in the example *lan Zaydan 'ukrima* 'I will not honor Zayd', whereas al-Farrā' allowed a separation in two additional cases: by the verb *'aẓunnu*, as in the example *lan 'aẓunnu 'azūraka* 'I will not visit you, I think' and by a protasis, as in the example *lan 'in tazurnī 'azūraka/ 'azurka* 'if you visit me, I will not visit you' (in which the relevant verb can be either *manšūb*, due to the effect of *lan*, or *majzūm*, if it is considered the *jawāb* 'apodosis' of the protasis).⁸⁶

6. CONCLUSION

Lan is one of the *'awāmil* causing the following verb to take *naşb*, which has not been widely discussed by either grammarians or modern scholars. One of the reasons seems to be that the common way of speech requires putting the following verb in *naşb*, with no possibility of using *raf'*, in contrast to other particles such as *hattā*, after which both moods are possible, and which have been thoroughly and extensively analyzed by grammarians. Having said that, one should take into account the (few) pieces of evidence that show that sometimes the verb following *lan* is *majzūm*. When such evidence comes from poetry, the grammarians usually contend, correctly I believe, that this exceptional mood is due to poetic license.

As for the etymology of *lan*, there are disputes among both grammarians and modern researchers, and several theories are offered. Etymological research is rather tempting, but etymological hypotheses are quite often hard to prove. Two views seem worthy of consideration: that of

⁸⁵ Ibn Jinnī claims that the speaker compares here between *lan* and *'anna*: as a *ẓarf* can separate between *'anna* and the noun it syntactically affects, like in *balaḡanī 'anna fī l-dāri Zaydan* 'It came to my knowledge that Zayd was at home', so is it possible in this verse, due to poetic license, that a *ẓarf* separates between *lan* and the following verb which it affects. See Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'is* (1990) II, 412, 1–8.

⁸⁶ See Ibn 'Uşfür, *Ḍarā'ir*, 201, 6–11; Abū Ḥayyān, *Tadrib*, 195, 5 last lines; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1644, 9–1645, 1; V, 2431, –5–4. See further Ibn 'Aqil, *Musā'id* III, 65, 7–10, where the author copies a part of Abū Ḥayyān's words, without mentioning his name; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham* IV, 96, 15–18.

Sibawayhi (and other grammarians after him), according to which *lan* is an independent word which is not made up of *lā*+*'an*; and that of Aartun, that views *lan* as derived from *lā* and the emphasizing particle *-n*, based on similar cases in Arabic and other Semitic languages. The view that *lan* is a compound of *lā*+*'an* is not too satisfactory, since the only argument in its favor is the fact that both *lan* and *'an* cause the following verb to be *manṣūb*, whereas there are several arguments against it, raised by some grammarians.

As for the character of the negation associated with *lan*, it seems correct to conclude that it is stronger and more emphatic than that associated with *lā*, but neither denotes *ta'bīd waṭūl al-mudda* nor the contrary, i.e. a short period. Tawāma presents an argument in this spirit.⁸⁷ The examples from the speech of the Bedouins, the Qur'ān and ancient poetry prove that negation with *lan* may be perpetual or temporary. In other words, it seems that the character of the negation using *lan* is not uniform, but can vary according to the context.

⁸⁷ See Tawāma, *Zaman*, 18–19.

CHAPTER THREE

KAY

1. INTRODUCTION

Kay, a particle followed by a *manṣūb* verb, is discussed rather briefly by both grammarians and modern researchers, together with the related *likay* and their two corresponding negative particles, *kaylā* and *likaylā*. Three other particles which may be followed by a *manṣūb* verb are also regarded as related to *kay*: *kaymā*, *likaymā*, and *kamā*.¹ These three are discussed in §§7–8.

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi does not devote a separate chapter to *kay*, which he mentions only rarely in his *Kitāb*, mainly in connection to the question of whether *kay* is followed by an *ʿan muḍmara* (see §6.1). He also briefly treats the time that the verb following *kay* conveys (see §4.1) and discusses the possibility of separating it from the following verb (see §5.1). The possibility of putting the verb after *kamā* in *naṣb* is briefly discussed, too (see §8.1).

1.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

Al-Farrāʾ, like Sībawayhi, does not discuss *kay* at length. In his *Maʿānī* I was unable to find any reference to the one issue that concerned Sībawayhi (and most succeeding grammarians) the most with respect to this particle, namely whether it is to be associated with a following *ʿan muḍmara*. Al-Farrāʾ disagrees with Sībawayhi on the issue of separating *kay* from the following verb (see §5.2). No references to the mood of the verb following *kamā* were found in his *Maʿānī*, but some grammarians attribute a certain opinion on this issue to him (see §8.2).

1.3. *Other grammarians*

The grammarians focus mainly on whether *kay* or a following *ʿan muḍmara* induce the verb to take *naṣb* (see §6.3). They also discuss the meaning of

¹ See, for example, al-Šanʿānī, *Tahḏīb*, 244, 3–4, where the author refers to all seven particles mentioned above as *luġāt* ‘dialectal forms’.

kay and the syntactic effect of *kaymā* on the following verb, issues that neither Sībawayhi nor al-Farrā' address (see §2.3 and §7.3, respectively).

2. THE MEANING OF *KAY*

According to the grammarians *kay* denotes the goal of an action. As Brockelmann notes, *kay* is the etymological parallel of the Hebrew *kī* 'because', but in Arabic it always designates the goal.²

2.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi does not explicitly define the meaning of *kay*, which can nevertheless be inferred from his short definition in chapter 508 of the *Kitāb*, in which various nouns and particles are briefly defined: *wa'ammā kay fajawābun liqawlihi kaymah kamā taqūlu limah fataqūlu liyaf'ala kaḍā wakaḍā* "as for *kay*, it is *jawāb* to the utterance *kaymah* 'for what?',³ as [in the example in which] you say *limah* 'for what?' and say [in response] *liyaf'ala kaḍā* 'in order that he do this and that'".⁴

To judge by Sībawayhi's short definition quoted above and his examples of the use of *kay*, he conceives of this particle as indicating the goal for which an action is carried out, just like the particle *li-* which has the meaning of *kay*, and is thus referred to as *lām kay* (for this particle, see chapter 9, §2).

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, does not explicitly define the meaning of *kay*, but the examples he cites for its use reveal that he, too, thinks that this particle indicates the goal of the action.

² See Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 612–613 (§404.k, including note).

³ The form *kaymah* is the *waqf* 'pausal form' of *kaymā*. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 134, 4; Wright, *Grammar* I, 274–275, note to §351. This is explicitly noted by al-Jurjānī and other grammarians, who explain how this form was created. See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1052, 6–9; al-Zamakhsharī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 152, 5–6; Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inṣāf*, 236, 21–237, 2; al-Xwārazmī, *Ṣarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* IV, 160, 1–2; Ibn Ya'īš, *Ṣarḥ* II, 927, 3–6; 1108, 14–16; 1217, 13–17; Ibn Hišām, *Ṣarḥ šuḍūr*, 286, 13–16.

⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* II, 333, 20–21. Cf. al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 542, 2–3 (also quoted in al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) XX, 136b, 2–5) for a similar definition.

2.3. Other grammarians

Other grammarians and lexicographers who discuss this issue mention the following meanings:

- a. *Al-ʿIlla liwuqūʿ al-šayʿ* ‘the reason for the thing’s occurrence’ or *taʿlīl* ‘introducing the reason’.⁵
- b. *Sababiyya*, i.e. the fact that the first action caused the second.⁶
- c. *Ġaraḍ* ‘goal’.⁷
- d. *Illa* and *ġaraḍ* together.⁸

3. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING KAY

Most primary and secondary sources do not discuss the mood of the verb following *kay*, which always takes *našb*.

3.1. Sībawayhi

Sībawayhi does not directly refer to the mood of the verb following *kay*, but classifies the latter as an *ʿāmil* which induces the verb to take *našb*.⁹

⁵ See Ibn Sīda, *Muḥkam* VII, 73, –9. Cf. Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1986) XV, 236a, –9–7, where Ibn Sīda is quoted without explicitly mentioning his name. Al-Jurjānī says that in *kay* there is a kind of *taʿlīl* and *ṭamaʿ* ‘desire’. For example, in the sentence *jīʾtuka kay tuʾṭiyānī* ‘I came to you in order that you give me [something]’, *jaʿalta l-ʾiṭāʾa ʿillatan lil-majīʾi wadalalta ʿannaka rajawta min ḍālika* ‘you conceived of the [action of] giving as the reason for the [action of] coming and you showed that you desired it’. See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 146, 10–12. Cf. al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 178, 6–7. For grammarians who refer to *kay* as a *ḥarf taʿlīl*, see al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufašṣal*, 152, 3–4; al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 80, 6; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 358, 8; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 354, –1–355, 2; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣṣīl* II.2, 16, 1–3; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Šarḥ*, 475, 3–4; Abū Ḥayyān, *Taḍyīl* III, 150, –3; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *ʾIršād* I, 641, –3.

⁶ See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ miʾa*, 16, 5–6; al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 216, 8. For this term, see appendix A, §12.

⁷ See Ibn Sīda, *Muxaṣṣaš* XIV, 46, 1–2; 55, –7–6; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufašṣal* IV, 159, 8–9; al-Šanʿānī, *Tahḍīb*, 240, –1–241, 1; 244, 6–7.

⁸ See al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 311, 1; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 1217, 11–12. Ibn Yaʿīš exemplifies these two meanings with the sentence *qaṣadtuka kay tuṭībanī* ‘I wanted to come to you in order that you reward me’, in which, he says, *kay* conveys that the goal (*ġaraḍ*) of wanting to come is the expected reward, and that the latter is the reason (*ʿilla*) for the former.

⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 361, 15. For examples in which the verb following *kay* is *manšūb*, see *ibid.*, 362, 10–12 and the references in §5.1.

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', too, does not discuss the mood of the verb following *kay*; however, a perusal of his references to *kay* shows that he also considers it a particle followed by *naṣb*.

3.3. *Other grammarians*

Some grammarians explicitly say that *kay* is always used as an *'āmil* that induces the following verb to take *naṣb*.¹⁰

4. THE TIME CONVEYED BY THE VERB FOLLOWING *KAY*

Just as the mood of the verb following *kay* is not in dispute, all agree that the time which this verb conveys is the future.

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

In chapter 237 of the *Kitāb*, devoted to the particle *'idan*, Sībawayhi briefly refers to the time that the verb following *kay* conveys. In reference to sentences in which the verb following *'idan* denotes an action in the present and thus takes the *raf'* and not the *naṣb* mood (see chapter 4, §6.1.3.3), he notes that the verb following the particles *'an* and *kay*, which induce the *naṣb* mood, cannot convey an action in the present (but rather in the future).¹¹

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' also briefly mentions that the verb following *kay* conveys an action occurring in the future.¹²

4.3. *Other grammarians*

A few grammarians explicitly say that the verb following *kay* always conveys a future time.¹³

¹⁰ See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 146, 13–14. Cf. al-Šanʿānī, *Tahdīb*, 243, –1; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* IV, 159, 9–10; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 16, 13–14; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šudūr*, 262, 1. Cf. chapter 2, §3.3.1.1.

¹¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 20–24.

¹² See al-Farrā', *Maʿānī* I, 261, 17–262, 2.

¹³ See al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 166, 3–4; Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʿAsrār*, 129, –4–3; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* IV, 159, 9–10; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 16, 13–14; Ibn Abī Rabiʿ, *Šarḥ* I, 289, 6.

5. THE SEPARATION BETWEEN KAY AND THE FOLLOWING VERB

While there is no dispute on the mood of the verb following *kay* and the time it conveys, the question of whether *kay* and the following verb can be separated is the subject of some debate. Whereas Sibawayhi objects to such a separation, al-Farrā' allows it. Most grammarians support Sibawayhi's opinion, but some follow al-Farrā's view.

5.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi in a number of places characterizes examples as ungrammatical because *kay* is separated from the verb it syntactically affects:

- a. The example **kay Zaydun ya'tiyaka* 'in order that Zayd come to you' is presented in chapter 6 as ungrammatical, since the speaker orders the sentence constituents incorrectly.¹⁴ It can thus be inferred that placing a noun between *kay* and the following verb is unacceptable for Sibawayhi.
- b. In chapter 57 Sibawayhi says that it is as inappropriate for a noun to follow *'an*, as it is to follow *kay*. He explicitly speaks of *qubḥ kay 'Abdu llāhi yaqūla dāka* "the inappropriateness of [the sentence] **kay 'Abdu llāhi yaqūla dāka* 'in order that 'Abdallāh say that'".¹⁵
- c. In chapter 237 Sibawayhi mentions that it is ungrammatical to say **kay Zaydun yaqūla dāka* 'in order that Zayd say that'.¹⁶
- d. In chapter 256 Sibawayhi says that it is ungrammatical to say **ji'tu kay Zaydun yaqūla dāka* 'I came in order that Zayd say that'.¹⁷

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', unlike Sibawayhi, argues that *kay* and the following verb may be separated. The example he adduces for such a separation is *'ātika kay 'in tuḥaddiṭnī biḥadiṭin 'asma'hu minka* 'I will come to you in order that if you tell me a Ḥadiṭ, I will hear it from you'. In this sentence a protasis of a conditional clause follows *kay*, and the following verb, which *kay* should

¹⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 7, 16–17. Cf. al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) II, 91, –2–92, 2.

¹⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 124, 2–3.

¹⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 16–17.

¹⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 406, 1–4; 406, 7–14. Cf. *ibid.*, 428, 6 (chapter 274).

have induced to take *naṣb*, is put in *jazm*. Al-Farrā' explains that this verb is *majzūm* because it follows another *majzūm* verb, viz. *tuḥaddiṭnī*.¹⁸

5.3. Other grammarians

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that *kay* and the following verb should not be separated.¹⁹ Al-Kisā'ī is mentioned as holding the opposite opinion. According to Ṭa'lab al-Kisā'ī allows such a separation, but in that case the influence which *kay* should have had on this verb is canceled (This opinion is explicitly expressed by al-Farrā'; see §5.2 above). Al-Kisā'ī is quoted as having provided the example '*ataytuka kay fīnā tarǧabu* 'I came to you in order that you desire us', in which the relevant verb is *marfū'* and not *maṣṣūb*.²⁰

Ibn Mālik allows *kay* and the following verb to be separated but, contrary to al-Kisā'ī, maintains that the verb remains *maṣṣūb*, due to the effect of *kay*. He adds that what can separate *kay* from the following verb is either an element which the verb affects syntactically (as in the above-mentioned example attributed to al-Kisā'ī) or a protasis (as in the example quoted by al-Farrā' and discussed in §5.2 above).²¹ Abū Ḥayyān says that according to al-Kisā'ī an oath can also separate the two, as in '*azūruka kay wallāhi tazūrunī* 'I will visit you, in order that, by God, you will visit me', but then *kay* can no longer affect the following verb.²² Abū Ḥayyān also notes that according to the Baṣrans, Hišām and some Kūfan grammarians, *kay* and the following verb can only be separated by *mā* (i.e. *mā l-zā'ida* 'mā added [for emphasis]', having no syntactic influence), *lā* (i.e. *lā l-nāfiya* 'lā of negation') or both. In other words, when *kay* is not directly followed by a verb, the three options are *kaymā*, *kaylā* or *kaymā lā*, respectively, followed by a verb in *naṣb*.²³

¹⁸ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 69, 2–3. Al-Farrā's comments on *kay* appear as part of his discussion of other instances in which the verb is *majzūm* and not *marfū'*, as expected, because of a preceding *majzūm* verb. See *ibid.*, 68, 8–69, 2.

¹⁹ See, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 231, 8–10; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 62, 1–3.

²⁰ See Ṭa'lab, *Majālis* I, 127, 10–11. Cf. Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 84, 7–8, where a similar example is quoted (beginning with the verb *jī'tuka* instead of the synonymous '*ataytuka*').

²¹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣhīl* II.2, 18, 13–17. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1648, 9–1649, 2, where Ibn Mālik, as well as his son, are quoted in this context.

²² See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1648, 6–8. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 102, 2–4, where the author probably quotes Abū Ḥayyān.

²³ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1647, –3–1648, 6. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 101, –6–102, 2, where the author probably quotes Abū Ḥayyān. See also Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 72, 10–11; 83, 8–15, where the author emphasizes that the separation which al-Kisā'ī allows and discusses is not attested in the speech of the Bedouins.

6. IS THERE AN 'AN MUḌMARA AFTER KAY?

6.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi does not posit an 'an muḍmara after *kay* and regards the latter as the 'āmil affecting the following verb. However, he says that some speakers consider *kay* to be a *ḥarf jarr* 'preposition', followed by an 'an muḍmara. Here is a brief overview of his discussion.

In chapter 233, devoted to the imperfect verbs, Sibawayhi discusses the three particles 'an, *kay* and *lan* which directly induce the following verb to take *naṣb*. It is thus clear that for Sibawayhi the verb following *kay* is *manṣūb* due to the direct effect of *kay* and not due to 'an muḍmara.²⁴

However, in the following chapter, devoted to particles that are followed by an 'an muḍmara, Sibawayhi states that for some speakers an 'an muḍmara following *kay* must be posited as the 'āmil which induces *naṣb*. Such speakers, he claims, treat *kay* like *ḥattā* (a preposition which syntactically affects nouns and not verbs), as in *kaymah* 'for what?' (see note 3), which is similar to *ḥattā mah* 'until what?', *ḥattā matā* 'until when?' and *limah* 'for what?'.²⁵ Sibawayhi subsequently refers to the possibility of joining *li-* and *kay* to form *likay*, and to the difference between the two groups of speakers, those who treat *kay* as a *ḥarf naṣb* and those who treat it as a *ḥarf jarr*. He says that speakers who use *likay* and do not use *kaymah* (i.e. do not use *kay* as a preposition), treat *kay* like 'an (i.e. syntactically affecting itself the following verb), whereas speakers who use *kaymah*, treat *kay* like *li-* (i.e. a preposition which syntactically affects nouns, following which 'an muḍmara must be posited).²⁶

In chapter 238, one of three dedicated to *ḥattā*, Sibawayhi briefly refers again to *kay* that is treated (by certain speakers) as a *ḥarf jarr*, the verb following which being *manṣūb* due to 'an muḍmara.²⁷

²⁴ For his example of *kay* see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 361, 15.

²⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 8–10. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 147, 15–17; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 83, 10–13; al-Fārisī, *Īdāḥ* II, 1051, –1–1052, 2 (and the commentary in al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1052, 5–11); al-Warrāq, *Ilal*, 73, 8–9; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* III, 5–8; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 265, 11–14; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* I, 350, 14–16; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.1, 149, 3–4; II.2, 16, 4–6; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 255, –5–3; Ibn Abī Rabīʿ, *Šarḥ* I, 231, 4–7; Ibn Abī Rabīʿ, *Kāfi* II, 239, 9–240, 1; al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 215, 2–6; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 261, 3 last lines; Ibn Hišām, *ʿAwdāḥ* I, 337, 1–2; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šudūr*, 286, 10–16; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid* II, 261, 3–4; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 98, –6–3.

²⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 10–12.

²⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 9–11. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Taʿliq* II, 136, 2–6.

6.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not refer to this issue in his *Ma'ānī*.

6.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians accept Sibawayhi's position, that *kay* can be *ḥarf naṣb* and *ḥarf jarr*.²⁸ Al-Sīrāfi and al-Fārisī explain at length that when *kay* is an *'āmil* which induces the following verb to take *naṣb*, it is like *'an* which functions in the same role. The evidence for that is that the particle *li-* can be joined to *kay* (resulting in *likay*), just as it can be joined to *'an* (resulting in *li'an*). When, on the other hand, *kay* is conceived as a *ḥarf jarr*, *naṣb* is caused by *'an muḍmara*, found in the *taqdīr* structure.²⁹

Some later grammarians express an opinion which at first sight seems different, but actually corresponds to Sibawayhi's view. They give three possible analyses of *kay*:³⁰

- a. As *ḥarf naṣb*. This analysis is compulsory when *li-* and *kay* are joined to form *likay*, since if *kay* were a *ḥarf jarr* in this case, an impossible sequence of two prepositions would be created.
- b. As *ḥarf jarr*. This analysis is compulsory when *mā* follows *kay*, creating *kaymā* (or *kaymah* in the pausal form).
- c. As either *ḥarf naṣb* or *ḥarf jarr*, according to the speaker's desire. This analysis is possible whenever *kay* directly precedes the verb.

6.3.1. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans on whether kay is a ḥarf jarr*
This dispute is closely connected to the question of what induces the verb following *kay* to be *manṣūb*. Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a chapter in his *'Inṣāf* to this question. Below is a description of the parties' opinions and arguments.³¹

²⁸ See, for example, al-Axḫaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 300, 4–12; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 9, 1–4; al-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 83, 4–84, 2; al-Fārisī, *Baḡdādiyyāt*, 195–197 (*mas'ala* 22); al-Fārisī, *Baṣriyyāt* I, 230, 7–13 (part of *mas'ala* 3).

²⁹ For references to al-Sīrāfi's and al-Fārisī's explanations, see previous note.

³⁰ See Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 161, 6–162, 2; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 358, 8–359, 1; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 926, 20–927, 7; 1108, 10–20; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 50, 1–51, 5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 115, 1–116, 19; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣhīl* I.1, 224, 4–9; II.2, 16, 1–17; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 264–265; Ibn Hišām, *'Awḍaḥ* II, 72, 11–73, 6; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ ṣuḍūr*, 259–261; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* I, 171, 8–12.

³¹ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inṣāf*, 235–238 (*mas'ala* 78). Abū Ḥayyān briefly presents the main points of this discussion. See Abū Ḥayyān, *Manhaj*, 232, 5–233, 2; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1645, 10–13.

The Kūfans claim that *kay* is *ḥarf naṣb* and not *ḥarf jarr*, whereas the Baṣrans argue that it can be used as both. The Kūfans say that *kay* is an ‘*āmil* which syntactically affects verbs, and thus even according to the Baṣrans cannot be a *ḥarf jarr*, i.e. an ‘*āmil* which affects nouns (this claim goes back to the principle of *al-‘āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ* explained in appendix A, §1.1). In addition, they ask, how could *kay* be conceived as a *ḥarf jarr*, if the *ḥarf jarr li-* can join it, when according to the Baṣrans themselves a sequence of two *ḥarf jarrs* is not possible?

The Baṣrans, on the other hand, say that *kay* is used as *ḥarf jarr* in *kaymah* and that it can be used in some contexts as such, and in others as *ḥarf naṣb*. They add that even according to the Kūfans there are particles, such as *hattā*, which are sometimes used as *ḥarf jarr* and sometimes as *ḥarf naṣb*, as are some other ‘*awāmil* as well, such as *ḥāšā* and *xalā* ‘besides, other than’.

6.3.1.1. *The opinion attributed to Ibn al-Sarrāj and held by Ibn al-Ḥājjib, that kay itself induces naṣb* The opinion attributed to Ibn al-Sarrāj and explicitly expressed by Ibn al-Ḥājjib is similar to the opinion of the Kūfans, presented in §6.3.1 above. Ibn Yaʿīṣ quotes Ibn al-Sarrāj to the effect that *kay* can be regarded only as *ḥarf naṣb*. In that case the compound *kaymah* in which *kay* joins a noun (*mā*) can be explained by the similarity in the meanings of *kay* and *li-*: due to its similarity to *li-*, *kay* can join nouns just as *li-* can.³² It is, however, important to note that the opinion explicitly expressed by Ibn al-Sarrāj in his *ʿUṣūl* is not what Ibn Yaʿīṣ attributes to him, but rather one which corresponds to Sībawayhi’s view that there are two ways of treating *kay*: as a *ḥarf naṣb* and as a *ḥarf jarr* (see §6.1; for a reference see note 25).

Ibn al-Ḥājjib expresses an opinion similar to the one attributed to Ibn al-Sarrāj, but even more extreme. He states that *kay* is always a *ḥarf naṣb*, since there is no difference in meaning between the uses of *likay* and *kay*. Ibn al-Ḥājjib explicitly says that one should not claim, as some do (he means Sībawayhi and most subsequent grammarians), that *kay* in *likay* is a *ḥarf naṣb*, whereas *kay* used alone (without *li-* attached to it) is a *ḥarf jarr*. He adds that the only instance in which *kay* is used as a *ḥarf jarr* is in *kaymah*, and from this sole example one should not deduce a generalization that *kay* can be conceived as *ḥarf jarr*.³³

³² See Ibn Yaʿīṣ, *Šarḥ* II, 1108, 20–21.

³³ See Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 13, 8–14, 2.

6.3.2. *The syntactic status of kay following li- (likay) or preceding it (kay li-)*

Most grammarians from Sibawayhi onwards refer to the syntactic status of *kay* in *likay*, but only a few refer to its status in *kay li-*. The reason is clear: *likay* occurs very frequently, whereas evidence for *kay li-* is extremely limited.³⁴

6.3.2.1. *The syntactic status of kay following li- (likay)* Sibawayhi and most grammarians consider *kay* in *likay* a particle which syntactically affects the following verb. Like *'an*, *kay* is also referred to in this context as *ḥarf maṣdariyy*, i.e. a particle which combines with what follows it to form a *maṣdar*-like utterance (for *'an*, see chapter 1, §2). The main argument in favor of this analysis is that if *kay* in *likay* were considered a preposition, the result would be an impossible sequence of two prepositions, *li-* and *kay*.³⁵

For a dissenting opinion, attributed to Ibn al-Sarrāj and expressed by Ibn al-Ḥāḍib, see §6.3.1.1 above.

6.3.2.2. *The syntactic status of kay preceding li- (kay li-)* Ibn Mālik is one of the few grammarians who refer to the rare occurrence of *kay* before *li-*. He quotes two lines of poetry in which, he says, *kay* is a *ḥarf jarr* and not a *ḥarf naṣb* while the following *li-* serves for emphasis. He argues that this explanation is preferable to treating *kay* as a *ḥarf naṣb*, since in Arabic one particle can emphasize another, but *li-* never occurs after a *ḥarf naṣb*.³⁶ The two verses quoted by Ibn Mālik are:

- a. *Fa'awqadtu nārī kay liyubšira ḍaw'ahā / wa'axrajtu kalbī wahuwa fī l-bayti dāxiluh* 'I lit my fire so the guest may see its light and I let out my dog that was at home, inside it'.³⁷

³⁴ According to Ibn 'Aqīl al-Farrā' reports that in the speech of the Bedouins sentences like *'aradtu likay 'aqšidaka* 'I wanted to get you' are very common, whereas sentences like *'aradtu kay li'aqšidaka* (with the same meaning) are very few. See Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 71, 11–12.

³⁵ See, for example, al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* III, 12; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣṣīl* II.2, 17, 4–7.

³⁶ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣṣīl* II.2, 17, 8–13. Cf. grammarians who quote Ibn Mālik's opinion in this aspect: Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1647, 7–8; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 68, 11–14; 69, 9–13; 71, 7–10; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 184, 1–185, 1.

³⁷ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Ḥatīm b. 'Adī l-Ṭā'ī. Al-Suyūṭī mentions that the *Ḥamāsa* has the following version of the verse: *fa'abraztu nārī ṭumma 'aṭabtu ḍaw'ahā* 'I made my fire noticeable and afterwards I magnified its light [by adding more kindling]'. He rightfully adds that in this version there is no evidence for *kay li-*. See al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ*

- b. *Kādū binaşri Tamīmin kay liyulḥiqahum / fihi faqad balağū l-'amra llađī kādū* 'they were near to assisting [the tribe of] Tamīm in order that it attach them to it, and they arrived at the matter to which they were near (or: which they plotted)^{38, 39}

Ibn Hišām cites another line of poetry (which will not be quoted here) and argues, like Ibn Mālik, that in this rare instance of *kay li-*, *kay* must be conceived as a preposition.⁴⁰

6.3.3. *The dispute among Başrans and Kūfans on whether 'an can follow kay*

In chapter 234 Sibawayhi states that *'an* cannot follow *kay* in the literal utterance. He argues that *'an muđmara* which is posited after this particle in the *taqdīr* utterance becomes a replacement for *'an* in the literal utterance (the same explanation is provided for *hattā*; see chapter 8, §9.1).⁴¹

Centuries later, Ibn al-Anbārī devoted a chapter in his *'Inşāf* to the question of whether *'an* can follow *kay*, which he says was in dispute among Başrans and Kūfans.⁴² Here is a description of the opinions and arguments presented by both sides.⁴³

The Başrans claim that *'an* cannot occur after *kay*, whereas the Kūfans allow it. According to the Kūfans the sentence *ji'tu likay 'an 'ukrimaka* 'I came in order that I honor you' is grammatical, and *likay* here induces the following verb to take *naşb* while the particle *'an* is its *tawkīd* 'emphasis', i.e. an emphasizing element with no syntactic influence. Some Kūfans even say that the particle *li-* in this case induces *naşb* and that both *kay* and *'an* are its *tawkīd*.

şawāhid (1904), 173, 22–174, 3, where the author also explains the verse and the context in which it was said.

³⁸ The verb *kādū* here can be conceived as derived from the root *kwd*, meaning 'to be near to [doing something]' (as at the beginning of the verse) or from the root *kyd*, meaning 'to plot'. The verb *kāda* in the former meaning occurs regularly with a following verb, which in that case has to be posited here.

³⁹ A verse in the *basīṭ* meter, by al-Ṭirmāḥ. For other grammarians who cite this verse in the same context see al-Murādi, *Janā*, 264, 9–265, 1; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham* IV, 100, 7–8.

⁴⁰ See Ibn Hišām, *'Awḍaḥ* II, 72, –1–73, 2. Cf. al-Azharī, *Taşrīḥ* II, 360, –2–361, 2.

⁴¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 12–16. Cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Xaşā'iş* (1990) III, 263, 9–264, 3.

⁴² The chapter is devoted mainly to the possibility of *'an* occurring after *likay*, but also after *hattā*. The arguments and conclusions for both particles are the same.

⁴³ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inşāf*, 241–243 (*mas'ala* 80). Al-Suyūṭī briefly introduces this dispute and expresses his support for the Başrans' view. See al-Suyūṭī, *Aşbāḥ* (1998) I, 673, 7–8.

The Baṣrans, on the other hand, argue that in sentences with *likay*, *kay* is an ‘*āmil*’ that syntactically affects the verb, and therefore there is no reason for positing ‘*an*’ in the *taqdīr* structure, not to mention in the literal utterance. Secondly, they say that there are no examples for the sequence *likay* ‘*an*’ in the speech of the Bedouins.

Some grammarians express their support for the possibility of ‘*an*’ following *kay* only in the case of (*li*)*kaymā*. According to Ibn al-Ḥāḥib and Abū Ḥayyān, for example, ‘*an*’ may follow *kay*, but only when preceded by *mā*, thus creating the rare sequence *kaymā* ‘*an*’. Ibn al-Ḥāḥib says that ‘*iḥḥāru* ‘*an* *ba’dahā qalīlun ‘ayḍan mašrūṭun bimā* ‘pronouncing ‘*an*’ following it (*kay*) is limited and depends on [the existence of] *mā* [following *kay*]’.⁴⁴ Al-Astarābādī quotes al-Axfāš as supporting the occurrence of ‘*an*’ following *kay*, based on two lines of poetry in which ‘*an*’ follows *kaymā*.⁴⁵ This view corresponds to Ibn al-Ḥāḥib’s and Abū Ḥayyān’s opinion explained above.

7. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING *KAYMĀ*

7.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi does not discuss the occurrence of a verb following *kaymā* and only briefly refers to the *waqf* form of the latter, *kaymah* (see §2.1).

7.2. *Al-Farrā’*

Al-Farrā’ does not explicitly discuss the mood of the verb following *kaymā*, but it can be inferred from his *Ma‘ānī* that in his opinion it should be in *naṣb*.⁴⁶

7.3. *Other grammarians*

A few grammarians mention *kaymā* as a particle following which the verb is *manṣūb*.⁴⁷ Asked about the difference between *kaylā* and *kaymā*,

⁴⁴ See Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, *Šarḥ* II, 267, 3–4. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1646, 11ff.

⁴⁵ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 47, –4–48, 2.

⁴⁶ See al-Farrā’, *Ma‘ānī* I, 261, 17–262, 7, where two lines of poetry are cited in which an imperfect verb follows *likaymā*.

⁴⁷ See Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, 147, 6; al-Xwārazmī, *Maḥāṭib*, 63, 1; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 311, 1–5. See also al-Zubaydī I-Isbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 73, –5 and 74, 5, for two examples of *naṣb* following *kaymā* and *likaymā*, respectively.

Ṭa'lab answers that only the former is a negative particle (meaning 'in order that not'), whereas the latter means 'in order to'.⁴⁸ He does not explicitly refer to the mood of the verb following these two particles, but it can be inferred that he posits *naṣb* for both. In reference to the same two particles al-Ḥarīrī explicitly says that *mā* in *kaymā* does not change the meaning of *kay*,⁴⁹ and is therefore referred to as *mā l-zā'ida*, which has no syntactic influence (as already mentioned towards the end of §5.3).⁵⁰

Other grammarians argue that the verb following *kaymā* is *marfū'*, as proven by the following line of poetry: *'idā 'anta lam tanfa' faḍurra fa'innamā / yurajjā l-fatā kaymā yaḍurru wayanfa'u* 'if you do not benefit, harm! Men are hoped to harm and to benefit'.⁵¹ Al-Axfaš, who quotes this verse, explains that *kay* here is a *ḥarf jarr* and that *mā* introduces an utterance which is equivalent to a noun in the *jarr* case.⁵² Quoting the same verse, al-Fārisī proposes two explanations for the *raf'* mood following *kaymā* in general and in this verse in particular. The first is that the *mā* in this case is *mā l-maṣdariyya*, i.e. *mā* which introduces an utterance which is equivalent to a *maṣdar*: the utterance *kaymā yaf'alu* is thus equivalent to *lil-fi'l* (this is exactly the explanation proposed by al-Axfaš and mentioned above). The second explanation is to understand *mā* as *mā l-kāffa* 'the preventing *mā*', i.e. *mā* which blocks the syntactic effect of the particles to which it is annexed (such as *'innamā* or *rubbamā*, which have no effect on the following noun).⁵³

⁴⁸ See Ṭa'lab, *Majālis* I, 151, 1–2. Cf. al-Azharī, *Tahdīb* X, 418b, 4–6.

⁴⁹ See al-Ḥarīrī, *Durra*, 203, 12–14, where he explains that the difference in meaning between *kaylā* and *kaymā* results in an orthographic difference: the former should be written as two separate words (*kay lā*) and the latter as one (*kaymā*), because in the former *lā* changes the meaning of *kay* and in the latter *mā* does not. It is noteworthy, however, that this difference in orthography has no foundation in actual use.

⁵⁰ Reckendorf, on the other hand, claims that *kaymā* can be used as a negative particle. He records one example of this usage by al-Ṭabarī. See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 733, note 3.

⁵¹ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Qays b. al-Xaṭīm, 'Abdallāh b. Mu'āwiya, al-Nābiġa l-Ja'dī, al-Nābiġa l-Dubyanī or 'Abd al-A'lā b. 'Abdallāh. See al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* III, 245–246. Cf. Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 141b, 4 and the editors' remarks in al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1981) I, 124, note 497; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 51, verse 641; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* I, 351, note 1.

⁵² See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1981) I, 124, 4–8 = al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 305, 10–306, 4. Cf. Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* I, 351, 1–4; II, 116, 7–11; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.1, 149, 1–2; II.2, 16, 6–9; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 166, 2–5; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 256, 4–6; 474, 20–475, 2; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 98, –2–99, 1.

⁵³ See al-Fārisī, *Baġdādiyyāt*, 290, 6–10. For the second explanation, see also al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 233, 8ff.

7.4. *Secondary sources*

Modern scholars, just like the above-mentioned grammarians, have varying opinions concerning the mood of the verb following *kaymā*. Some early modern scholars adduce examples of *kaymā* and *likaymā* as particles following which a *maṣṣūb* verb appears.⁵⁴ Wright does provide examples of *naṣb* following *kaymā* and *likaymā*, but adds in a note that it seems that the addition of *mā l-maṣḍariyya* to *kay* may prevent the syntactic influence of the latter, as in a specific line of poetry (which the grammarians also cite; see §7.3).⁵⁵

Nöldeke states that both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* are possible in the verb following *kaymā* and *likaymā*, and provides examples for both from *Kitāb al-ʿaḡānī* and other works, although he adds that he believes that the more common mood was *naṣb*.⁵⁶ Reckendorf is even more convinced than Nöldeke in this aspect, arguing that the occurrence of a *marfūʿ* verb following *kaymā* and *likaymā* is very rare.⁵⁷

8. CAN THE VERB FOLLOWING *KAMĀ* BE IN *NAṢB*?8.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi explicitly says that the verb following *kamā* takes *rafʿ*. In chapter 258 he enumerates and discusses several *ḥurūf* that may be followed by either nouns or verbs, since they have no syntactic influence (this is an implementation of the principle of *al-ʿāmil lahu xtiṣāṣ* explained in appendix A, §1.1). One of these *ḥurūf* is *kamā*.⁵⁸ Sībawayhi asks his teacher al-Xalīl about the syntactic influence of *kamā*, and quotes two examples from the speech of the Bedouins: *intaẓirni kamā ʿātika* and *urqubni kamā ʿalḥaquka*, both of which mean ‘wait for me and perhaps I will come to you’. Al-Xalīl answers that *kamā* is a compound of *ka-* and *mā* which precedes the verb like *rubbamā*. According to al-Xalīl the meaning of *kamā* in these examples is similar to *laʿalla* ‘perhaps’ (and so I translated the two

⁵⁴ See, for example, Kosegarten, *Grammatica*, 627 (end of §1339). Cf. Ullmann, *WKAS* I, 479b, 41–480b, 6, where some lines of poetry with *kaymā* and *likaymā* followed by *naṣb* are recorded.

⁵⁵ See Wright, *Grammar* II, 28, §(b); 29, note b.

⁵⁶ See Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 71, 4–9 (part of §58).

⁵⁷ See Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 458, §227, note 1; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 733, –2–734, 7 (end of §240).

⁵⁸ For the whole discussion see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 408, 10–19.

examples).⁵⁹ He adds that the verb following *kamā* does not take *naṣb*, just like the verb following *rubbamā*. At the end of his discussion of *kamā* Sibawayhi cites two lines of poetry in which this particle is followed by a *marfūʿ* verb:

- a. *Lā taštumi*⁶⁰ *l-nāsa kamā lā tuštamu* ‘do not curse the people and perhaps you will not be cursed’.⁶¹
- b. *Qultu liṣaybāna dnu min liqāʾih / kamā tuḡaddī l-qawma min šiwāʾih* ‘I told Ṣaybān: come near to meet it and perhaps you will feed the people from its roasted meat’.⁶²

8.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

In al-Farrāʾ’s *Maʿānī* this subject is not discussed, to the best of my knowledge, but some grammarians attribute to him an opinion different from Sibawayhi’s, although not with respect to the mood of the verb following *kamā*, but rather its meaning. Ibn Xarūf and Abū Ḥayyān say that according to al-Farrāʾ, in sentences with *kamā* such as *intazīrnī kamā ʾātika*, the *maṣḍar* of the main verb was omitted and the utterance which *kamā* introduces describes this *maṣḍar*. Hence the meaning of this sentence is *intazīrnī ntizāran ṣādiqan miṭla ʾityānī laka* ‘wait for me truly as my coming to you!’, which they subsequently explain by *fi lī bil-intizāri kamā ʾaḫi laka*

⁵⁹ Cf. al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 342, –3–343, 5, who supports this explanation and adds that the meaning of a compound may well be different than the meaning of its constituent elements, e.g. *mimmā*, which is a compound of *min* and *mā*, but does not have their meaning. See also chapter 2, §2.3.3.

⁶⁰ In the Derenbourg edition this word is vocalized *taštimu* (in *rafʿ*), but in the *Bulāq* edition the vocalization is *taštumi* (in *jazm* with a helping vowel). See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 408, 17 and Sibawayhi, *Kitāb (Bulāq)* I, 459, –1, respectively. It seems to me that the correct vocalization is *taštumi* in *jazm*, the verb introducing a prohibition, both because of the context and meaning of this verse and in light of the next verse quoted by Sibawayhi, which seems to have a similar structure: a verb in the imperative + *kamā* + an imperfect verb. Reckendorf, Brockelmann and Ullmann also have *taštumi* in their quote of the verse. See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 732, –3–2 (part of §239); Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 625, 19–25 (end of §413.7); Ullmann, *WKAS* I, 9b, 20–21.

⁶¹ A verse in the *rajaz* meter, by Ruʿba. Reckendorf and Brockelmann add a modal meaning to *kamā* and translate ‘do not curse the people as you do not want to be cursed’. For references see previous note.

⁶² A verse in the *rajaz* meter, by Abū l-Najm al-ʿIjlī. A different version of the second hemistich is *ʾannā nuḡaddī*. See al-Aḫfaš, *Maʿānī* (1985) II, 500, –1–501, 5; al-Fārisī, *Baṣṣariyyāt* I, 305, –1–306, 1. According to this version the verse provides no evidence for *kamā* followed by a verb. Al-Aḫfaš and al-Fārisī explain *ʾannā* in this version as having the meaning of *laʿallanā* (cf. al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 139, 2–3 and Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 1134, 12–21). However, in another book, al-Fārisī cites the verse with the version *kamā tuḡaddī* and explains the meaning of *kamā* at length. See al-Fārisī, *Baḡdādiyyāt*, 290, 1–10.

bil-ʿityāni ‘fulfill for me the waiting as I will fulfill for you the coming!’.⁶³ Ibn Xarūf agrees with this opinion attributed to al-Farrāʾ, and criticizes al-Xalīl’s claim (cited by Sibawayhi) that *kamā* in this context always has the meaning of *laʿalla*. Therefore, Ibn Xarūf understands the first line of poetry which Sibawayhi cites with *kamā* (see §8.1-a) as meaning *intahi ʿan šatmi l-nāsi kantihāʾihim ʿan šatmika* ‘stop cursing the people as they stop cursing you!’.⁶⁴

8.3. Other grammarians

The grammarians express various opinions on the mood of the verb following *kamā*.

Ṭaʿlab discusses the word *kamā* and the mood of the following verb in the verse *ismaʿ ḥadīṭan kamā yawman tuḥaddīṭuhu / ʿan ḡahri ḡaybin ʿiḍā mā sāʾilun saʾalā* ‘hear a Ḥadīṭ (or: a story) and perhaps one day you will tell it by heart, when someone shall ask’.⁶⁵ He presents the following opinions:⁶⁶

- a. The verb is *marfūʿ*. This is the opinion which both Sibawayhi and Ṭaʿlab himself hold. Ṭaʿlab attributes it to the Baṣrans in general, uses the above-mentioned verse as evidence and quotes the second of the two verses that Sibawayhi discusses (see §8.1-b) as another relevant piece of evidence.
- b. The verb is *manṣūb*, unless *kamā* is separated from the following verb, just as in the line of poetry cited above. Those who hold this opinion, says Ṭaʿlab, maintain that *kamā* is like *kay*, i.e. that it induces the following verb to take *naṣb* if this verb directly follows it (for the separation between *kay* and the following verb, see §5). Ṭaʿlab records two examples in corroboration of this view: the sentence *ʿataytuka kay finā tarḡabu* attributed to al-Kisāʾī and discussed at the beginning of §5.3, and the following line of poetry in which the verb directly follows *kamā* and is thus *manṣūb*: *waṭarfaka ʾimmā jiʾtanā faḡfaḡannahu /*

⁶³ See Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḡ*, 207, 8–14; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1715, 7–10.

⁶⁴ See Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḡ*, 208, 9–10; 207, 14–15. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1707, 7–10, who attributes this explanation of the verse to al-Farrāʾ.

⁶⁵ A verse in the *basīṭ* meter, by ʿAdī b. Zayd al-ʿIbādī.

⁶⁶ For the whole discussion, see Ṭaʿlab, *Majālis* I, 127, 6–128, 5 (part of the chapter *ʿurjūza šiniyya*: *ibid.*, 116–128). Only the two opinions concerning an imperfect verb following *kamā* will be introduced here; the third refers to sentences like *kamā qumta qumtu* ‘as you stood, so I stood’ which do not concern us here.

kamā yaḥsibū 'anna l-hawā ḥaytu tanzuru 'your look, when you come to us, keep away [from us], and perhaps (or: in order that) they think that love is where you look'.⁶⁷ Although Ṭa'lab does not say so explicitly, it can be inferred that this opinion is attributed to the Kūfans: first, because it contradicts the opinion explicitly attributed to the Baṣrans; secondly, because one of the examples which Ṭa'lab cites is taken from al-Kisā'i, one of the founders of the Kūfan school; thirdly, because al-Rummānī, Ibn al-Anbārī and al-Šantamarī explicitly attribute this opinion to the Kūfans.⁶⁸

Al-Zajjājī briefly states that *kamā* may have the meaning of *kay*, but does not say what mood the following verb takes.⁶⁹

Al-Fārisī and al-Rummānī agree with Sibawayhi. They add that *mā* in *kamā* is *mā l-kāffa*, in the words of al-Rummānī: *daxalat mā 'alā kāfi l-tašbihi litakuffahā 'ani l-'amali 'mā* is attached to *ka-* of comparison (i.e. the particle *ka-* 'as') and prevents it from having a syntactic effect [on what follows]. Al-Fārisī adds that the verb following *kamā* is *marfū'*.⁷⁰

Other grammarians explain that *kamā* is a short form of *kaymā* (an opinion mainly attributed to the Kūfans; see §8.3.1 below). Ibn Xarūf, who only mentions this view without agreeing with it, says that some who hold it claim that the following verb takes *raf'* because the *našb*-inducing particle *kaymā* was changed to *kamā*, whereas others insist that it is followed by a verb in *našb* and provide as evidence the first of the two verses which Sibawayhi cites in his discussion of *kamā* (see §8.1-a above), with the verb in *našb*: *lā taštumi l-nāsa kamā lā tuštama*. Ibn Xarūf rejects both this version of the verse in *našb* and the opinion that *kamā* is followed by a verb in this mood.⁷¹

⁶⁷ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Jamīl. Another version of the beginning of the second hemistich is *likay* instead of *kamā*. According to this version there is no evidence for *kamā* followed by *našb*. Al-Rummānī and Ibn al-Anbārī say that the Baṣrans quote this verse with *likay*, and the Kūfans with *kamā*. See al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 99, 15–100, 1; Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʿInšāf*, 244, 3–5; 244, 19–20 (part of *mas'ala* 81). Cf. al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 359, 4 last lines. For the dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans, see §8.3.1.

⁶⁸ For the references to al-Rummānī's and Ibn al-Anbārī's views see previous note. For al-Šantamarī see al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 761, 5–6.

⁶⁹ See al-Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf*, 34, –1–35, 1. A later grammarian who mentions this opinion explicitly says that in this case the verb takes *našb*. See al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 213, –3–214, 3.

⁷⁰ See al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 225, 8–12. For al-Rummānī's words, see *ibid.*, note 4.

⁷¹ See Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 208, 1–4. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 424, 8–9 = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 459–460; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1986) XV, 233; 236.

8.3.1. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans on whether the verb following kamā takes naṣb*

Ibn al-Anbārī devotes *mas'ala* 81 in his *'Inṣāf* to this issue. Here are the main ideas presented there.⁷²

The Kūfans claim that *kamā* occurs in the sense of *kaymā* and is followed by a *manṣūb* verb. However, they do not oppose putting this verb in *rafʿ*. Al-Mubarrad is reported to share the Kūfans' view.⁷³ They quote five lines of poetry to prove that in the speech of the Bedouins *kamā* means *kaymā* and is followed by a verb in *naṣb*.

The Baṣrans adopt Sibawayhi's explanation, that *kamā* is like *rubammā*, with the following verb in *rafʿ* (see §8.1). They refute each of the five lines of poetry which the Kūfans quote, using a variety of arguments to show that all the verbs in question should be in *rafʿ*. In addition they quote three other verses in which *kamā* is followed by a *marfūʿ* verb, including the two which Sibawayhi uses (see the end of §8.1).

8.4. *Secondary sources*

Only a few modern scholars refer to the possibility of *naṣb* following *kamā*. According to Reckendorf the structure in which *kamā* indicates a purpose and is followed by a verb in *naṣb* is quite rare. In one book he quotes three lines of poetry in which a verb in *naṣb* follows *kamā*, and in the other he records three verses in which the relevant verb is *marfūʿ*.⁷⁴

Fischer claims that the use of *kamā* in the sense of *kay* and followed by a *manṣūb* verb is a characteristic of the post-classical language.⁷⁵ The arguments for this claim are not clear.

Ba'albakī maintains that *kamā* is indeed followed by a verb in *naṣb* and provides support from other Semitic languages. In Ethiopic the use of *kama* occurs in the contexts in which *kay* is used in Arabic, and it is thus not surprising that *kamā* in Arabic functions like *kay*, inducing the following verb to take *naṣb*. Ba'albakī adds that *kama* in Ethiopic also means 'as',

⁷² See Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inṣāf*, 243–245 (*mas'ala* 81). For a short summary, see al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 343, –2–344, 4; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1649, 6–9.

⁷³ In his *Muqtaḍab* al-Mubarrad does not express any opinion on *kamā* and the mood of the following verb. Later sources, perhaps influenced by Ibn al-Anbārī, also mention that al-Mubarrad held the view of the Kūfans. See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1649, 6–7; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 98, 1; 102, 15–16.

⁷⁴ See Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 459, §228 and Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 732–733, §239, respectively. Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 625, 19–25 (end of §413.η).

⁷⁵ See Fischer, *Grammatik*, 190 = Fischer, *Grammatik (translation)*, 215 (§418, note 2).

just like *kamā* in Arabic. He accepts the Kūfan view as presented in Ibn al-Anbārī's *'Inṣāf*.⁷⁶

In *WKAS* the uses of *kamā* are extensively presented and demonstrated. Eight lines of poetry are cited with a verb following *kamā*; in six of these the verb's mood is in dispute, whereas in the other two, the same that are quoted by the Baṣrans is order to prove their opinion, the verb is in *rafʿ*.⁷⁷

9. CONCLUSION

Neither Arab grammarians nor moderns scholars have discussed the particle *kay* and the mood of the following verb at length. The reason for this is that the particle's syntactic effect on the following verb and the time which this verb conveys are not in dispute: *kay* is followed by a *manṣūb* verb and indicates a goal of a certain action, and this goal reflects an action which has not yet occurred and is therefore not certain.

Sībawayhi and most grammarians take *kay* to be either a *ḥarf naṣb*, which syntactically affects the verb directly, or a *ḥarf jarr*, followed by a verb which takes *naṣb* due to *'an muḍmara*. This analysis differs greatly from the way Sībawayhi and most grammarians treat the two particles *li-* and *hattā*, which they consider only as *ḥarf jarr*. The opinion attributed to the Kūfans (also attributed to and held by few non-Kūfans grammarians, like Ibn al-Sarrāj and Ibn al-Ḥājjib, respectively) is different, as they prefer to disregard what seems to be a very limited number of occurrences in which *kay* is used as *ḥarf jarr*, and thus regard it always as *ḥarf naṣb*.

As for other subjects related to *kay*, there are also disagreements among Baṣrans and Kūfans. Sībawayhi and most grammarians say that *kay* may not be separated from the following verb, while al-Kisā'ī and al-Farrā' allow some kinds of separation; the Baṣrans say that no *'an* may appear after *kay* in the literal utterance, but the Kūfans allow it.

The mood of the verb following the two particles *kamā* and *kaymā*, which are related to *kay*, is also in dispute among grammarians and modern researchers. Examples of both moods, *rafʿ* and *naṣb*, can be found. The disagreement with respect to *kamā* concerns not only the mood of the following verb (*rafʿ* or *naṣb*), but also its meaning ('perhaps', according to Sībawayhi, based on al-Xalīl, or 'as', according to an opinion attributed to al-Farrā' and supported by some grammarians).

⁷⁶ See Ba'albakī, *Dirāsāt*, 57, note 2; 251–252.

⁷⁷ See Ullmann, *WKAS* I, 9a, 37–9b, 37.

CHAPTER FOUR

'IDAN

1. INTRODUCTION

'*Idan* is a particle which under certain conditions induces the following imperfect verb to take the *naṣb* mood. Its literal meaning is 'thus, therefore',¹ and it introduces an utterance said following, or in response to, another utterance. Sībawayhi, al-Farrā' and subsequent grammarians present a comprehensive theory of '*idān* and its potential syntactic influence on the following verb. Other than the prototype sentences which Sībawayhi and al-Farrā' provide, they base themselves, as later grammarians do more extensively, on a number of Qur'ānic verses and lines of poetry in which '*idān* is followed by a verb.

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi discusses '*idān* in chapter 237 of his *Kitāb*, which can be divided into three main parts: a presentation of '*idān* and the sentence types in which its syntactic influence can be explained by analogy to '*urā* 'I think', a verb which belongs to the category of the '*af'āl al-šakk wal-yaqīn*;² other sentence types which are explained differently; and the question whether after '*idān* there is an '*an muḍmara*.³ Sībawayhi's views on the syntactic influence of '*idān* on the following verb and its conditions are presented in §6.1. His attempts to prove that '*idān* itself, and not '*an muḍmara*, influences the following verb to take *naṣb* are detailed in §7.1.

¹ Arabic '*idā* is phonetically similar to Hebrew '*āzay* 'thus, therefore'. Trumpp argues that the two words are cognate. He adds that their primary meaning is German *dann* 'then', although in Arabic this meaning is not indicated by '*idā* but by '*idān*. See Trumpp, *Bedingungssatz*, 84, where the author also explains the etymology of '*idā* and cites similar forms from Ethiopic, Hebrew and Arabic. See also *EALL* I, 467a, s.v. *conjunctions*, §2.

² The literal meaning of this technical term is 'verbs [which express] doubt or certainty'. These are doubly transitive verbs whose two objects are essential for the structure of the sentence and cannot be omitted. Such verbs, which are also called '*af'āl al-qulūb*, convey doubt ('to think that X is Y') or certainty ('to know that X is Y'). For a short definition of this term, see Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 452. See further Wright, *Grammar* II, 48, 18–52, 5.

³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 365, 6–366, 9; 366, 10–367, 1; 367, 1–5, respectively.

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' in his *Ma'ānī* discusses the three verses in the Qur'ān in which 'īdan is followed by an imperfect verb (these are thoroughly discussed in §8). In order to analyze al-Farrā's views on 'īdan, I used three main sources: his commentaries in his *Ma'ānī* on these three Qur'ānic verses, Beck's article comparing the views of Sībawayhi and al-Farrā' on 'īdan (Beck, 'Idan), and Kinberg's lexicon of the terms which al-Farrā' uses in *Ma'ānī* (Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*).

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Later grammarians discuss the issues treated by Sībawayhi and al-Farrā', and also additional topics, such as the etymology of 'īdan (see §4.3).

2. THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF 'IDAN: إِذَا OR إِذْنٌ?

'Idan can be written in Arabic in two ways: إِذَا and إِذْنٌ. These spellings reflect different views on its etymology and derivation (these will be thoroughly discussed in §4).

In the Qur'ān the word is spelled إِذَا throughout. In fact, even grammarians who hold the view that 'īdan should be spelled إِذْنٌ quote the relevant verses using the orthography إِذَا.

Caution must be exercised in analyzing the ways this word is written in a grammarian's work, because these might not reflect this grammarian's own view on the correct spelling, but rather the orthography in the manuscript(s) according to which the composition in question has been edited and published.⁴ Nevertheless, an examination of how this word is written in the grammarians' books is useful, for several reasons. First, the findings may after all reflect the opinion of the authors. Secondly, they certainly reflect the statistical frequency of each form. Finally, the examination reveals that the two forms may reflect two different tendencies of the schools of Baṣra and Kūfa (see below).

⁴ See, for example, al-Zamaxṣarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 48, 2–7 in the part dedicated to the differences among the manuscripts; Ibn Mālik, *Ṣarḥ 'umda*, 333, –1 and note 35 there, where it is indicated that in some manuscripts the word is written إِذَا, whereas in others the orthography إِذْنٌ is used. A clear example of incompatibility between a grammarian's view and the way the word is written in his work is al-Suyūṭī's *Itqān* (see al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān* (1857), 347, 11–350, 2), where the form إِذْنٌ appears throughout the discussion, although al-Suyūṭī explicitly says there (ibid., 349, 21–22) that the correct spelling is with an 'alif, viz. إِذَا.

2.1. *Sībawayhi*

In Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* only the form اِذَنْ can be found, both in the citations of the relevant Qur'ānic verses and in other contexts.⁵

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

In contrast to Sībawayhi in his *Kitāb*, only the form اِذَا appears in al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī*.⁶

2.3. *Other grammarians*

Sībawayhi's and al-Farrā's conflicting spellings of *ʾidan* could lead to the conclusion that the writing traditions of this word reflect a difference between the schools of Baṣra and Kūfa. Interestingly enough, al-Rummānī, does make such a claim, but he attributes the spelling اِذَا to the Baṣrans and اِذَنْ to the Kūfans,⁷ that is, contrary to the spelling in the works of Sībawayhi and al-Farrā'.

2.3.1. *The orthography of ʾidan in contexts other than quotations of Qur'ānic verses*

In most grammarians' books only the form اِذَنْ occurs.⁸ In some both forms, اِذَا and اِذَنْ, are used, apparently indiscriminately.⁹ Only in the works of al-Xalīl, al-Rummānī and Ibn Sīda the spelling اِذَا is always used.¹⁰

⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 365, 6–367, 5.

⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 273–274; II, 241; 338. Cf. Beck, *ʾIdan*, 432–434; Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 33; 120; 141; 143; 176; 718.

⁷ See al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 117, 2–4. Cf. al-Fayyūmī, *Miṣbāḥ* I, 10 (quoted and explained in Lane, *Lexicon* I, 41a, 26–29). Al-Rummānī subsequently explains that the difference between the orthographies اِذَا and اِذَنْ lies in whether one understands the last part of the word as a *tanwīn* or a *nūn*, respectively.

⁸ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 302, 5–12; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 6, 12; 7, 13; 10, 1–13, 3; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* (1973) II, 153–154; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 78–79; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 133–135; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 51, 12–18; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 109, 21; 151, 13–152, 2; 173, 11; al-Zamaxšarī, *Muqaddima*, 288, 3–7; al-Zamaxšarī, *ʾUnmūḍaj*, 114, 12–15; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1957) I, 67, 6–11; Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʾInšāf*, 81–84; al-ʿUkbarī, *Tibyān* I, 68; 183; Ibn Mu'tī, *ʾAlfiyya*, 9, 3; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Kāfiya* (1979) II, 235, 20–239, 11; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XIII, 13–14; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qatr* (1848), 22, 19–23, 7; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ*, 294, 5–11; al-Širbīnī, *Nūr*, 112, 4–114, 8.

⁹ See al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1973) II, 65–68; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 194, 5–6; 195, 9–13; 204, 5–206, 5; al-Sirāfi, *ʾAbyāt* II, 99–101; 143–145; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 20–926, 20; 1216, 19–1217, 2; 1396, 23–1397, 7; al-Suyūṭī, *ʾAšbāḥ* (1975) II, 159, 11–16; 237, 1–238, 11.

¹⁰ See al-Xalīl, *ʾAyn* VIII, 204, 2; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 116–117; Ibn Sīda, *Muxaṣṣaš* XIV, 59, 20–21.

2.3.2. The orthography of 'idan in quotations of Qur'ānic verses

Most grammarians quote the relevant Qur'ānic verses using the spelling اِذَا exclusively. The exceptions are Ibn al-Sarrāj, al-Fārisī, al-Zamaxšarī, al-Ḥimyarī, al-Astarābādī, al-Suyūṭī and al-Bustānī, in whose works the Qur'ānic verses are quoted with the form اِذَنْ.¹¹

2.4. Secondary sources

Most modern scholars present both spellings of 'idan,¹² while some only mention the form اِذَنْ.¹³

Ya'qūb summarizes the four opinions on the way 'idan should be written:¹⁴

- a. It should be always written اِذَا, as in the Qur'ān.
- b. It should be always written اِذَنْ.
- c. It should be written اِذَنْ when it induces the following verb to take *naṣb*, and اِذَا when it does not have this syntactic influence.¹⁵
- d. It should be written اِذَا in *waqf* 'pausal form' and اِذَنْ in *waṣl* 'non-pausal form', in order to represent its different pronunciations ('idā in *waqf* and 'idan in *waṣl*).

2.5. Conclusion

The form اِذَنْ is statistically more common than اِذَا. However, اِذَا is quite likely the original spelling, as the (adverbial) accusative form of اِذْ. In this

¹¹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1973) II, 154, 7–9; al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 134, 9; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 151, –1; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1951) I, 67, 8–9; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 8–9; 236, 26–27; 236, 32; 237, 29; 238, 9; al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1857), 347, 17–18; 348, 9–14; 348, 21–22; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* I, 15a, 20.

¹² See, for example, Erpenius, *Grammar*, 61, 2 (where اِذَا is presented as a secondary form); Michaelis, *Grammatik*, 142, 1; de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 521, note; II, 29 (§63); Ewald, *Grammar* II, 118, 15–16; Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 541; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 745, note; Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 456–457 (§225); Gaudefroy-Demombynes-Blachère, *Grammaire*, 458 (§461); 467 (§478); Wright, *Grammar* II, 33, 21.

¹³ See, for example, Freytag, *Lexicon* I, 23; Cheikho-Durand, *Elementa*, 136, 9.

¹⁴ For the discussion, see Ya'qūb, *Ḥurūf*, 88–89 (§5).

¹⁵ Some sources attribute this opinion to al-Farrā' (see Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 312, 5 last lines, where al-Farrā's *al-Iqtidāb* is quoted), but Ibn Hišām claims that al-Farrā' in fact had the opposite view, that it should be written اِذَا when it induces the following verb to take the *naṣb* mood and اِذَنْ when it does not (see Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 31; cf. Howell, *Grammar* III, 659, 3–9 and Lane, *Lexicon* I, 41a, 29–34, where Ibn Hišām's opinion is quoted and explained).

I follow al-Xalīl's opinion as expressed in his *Kitāb al-'ayn* (see §5.3.1). This is also the opinion of de Sacy and Fleischer, quoted in §3.4 and §§4.4.1–4.4.2.

3. IS 'IDAN A ḤARF 'PARTICLE' OR AN ISM 'NOUN'?

3.1. Sibawayhi

Sibawayhi considers 'idan a ḥarf which induces the following verb to take *naṣb*, as inferred from chapter 237 of his *Kitāb*.¹⁶

3.2. Al-Farrā'

Al-Farrā' does not explicitly refer to this question; from his discussion of 'idan it is not possible to infer his view in this aspect.

3.3. Other grammarians

The vast majority of grammarians consider 'idan as one of the *ḥurūf* 'particles' which cause the following verb to take *naṣb*.¹⁷

Ibn Hišām in his *Muḡnī* states that according to common opinion 'idan is an independent ḥarf. He also mentions the contrary view, that 'idan is an *ism* which was originally a combination of 'idā followed by a verb. According to this opinion, what followed 'idā was omitted and the *tanwīn* was added to 'idā as compensation for this omission,¹⁸ thus creating the form 'idan.¹⁹

¹⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 365, 6–367, 5. For the first reference to 'idan as a ḥarf, see *ibid.*, 365, 18.

¹⁷ See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 6, 12; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 116–117; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1973) II, 152, 5–6; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 78, 12–13; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 194, 6; al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 66; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 51, 12–13; Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'iṣ* (1990) II, 256, 3–8; al-Zamakhṣārī, *Muqaddima*, 288, 3–7; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1951) I, 67, 6–11; al-'Ukbarī, *Tibyān* I, 68; 183; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 925, 20; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1848), 22, 21.

¹⁸ Grammarians refer to this *tanwīn* as *tanwīn al-'iwaḍ* 'the *tanwīn* of compensation'. For an explanation of this term, see, for example, Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 446–447.

¹⁹ The example that Ibn Hišām cites in order to explain the second opinion is the sentence 'idan 'ukrimaka 'therefore, I will honor you', which is said following, or in response to, the sentence 'ajī'uka 'I will come to you'. According to those who hold this opinion, the origin of the sentence 'idan 'ukrimaka is 'idā jī'tanī 'ukrimaka 'when you come to me, I will honor you', from which the verb immediately following 'idā (i.e. jī'tanī) was omitted and the *tanwīn* was added to 'idā as compensation. See Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 30. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān* (1857), 349, 13–16. For a similar explanation, see al-Fayyūmī, *Miṣbāḥ* I, 10 (quoted by Lane, *Lexicon* I, 41a, 62–65). See also Howell, *Grammar* III, 656, 21–657, 3; Lane, *Lexicon* I, 41a, 34–43; 41a, 53–62; Ya'qūb, *Ḥurūf*, 83b, 17–23.

Al-Astarābādī belongs to the minority that treats *'iḍan* as an *ism*. He states that it is not a *ḥarf* like its sisters (the particles *'an*, *lan* and *kay*, which, like *'iḍan*, induce the following verb to take *naṣb*, with no *'an muḍmara*). His explanations are similar to Ibn Hišām's, mentioned above.²⁰

3.4. Secondary sources

De Sacy considers *'iḍan* the accusative form of *'iḍ*,²¹ and so implicitly considers it an *ism*, since a *ḥarf* cannot take *tanwīn*. Fleischer agrees with de Sacy and adds that *'iḍan* is the accusative form of the demonstrative noun *'iḍ*, which does not appear in the nominative, but only in the accusative or genitive case. Its accusative form is *'iḍan* and its genitive form is found in compounds as *ḥīna'iḍin* 'then' and *yawma'iḍin* 'at that day' (literally: 'in the time of then' and 'in the day of then', respectively).²²

4. IS *'IDAN* ETYMOLOGICALLY A NOUN ENDING WITH A *TANWĪN* (DERIVED FROM *'ID* OR *'IDĀ*), AN INDEPENDENT WORD, A COMPOUND OF *'ID* AND *'AN* OR A COMPOUND OF *'ID* AND THE SUFFIX *-N*?

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

In his *Kitāb* *Sībawayhi* does not refer to this issue.

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Like *Sībawayhi*, *al-Farrā'* does not express an opinion on this matter.

4.3. Other grammarians

Many grammarians do not discuss the etymology of *'iḍan*. Here are the opinions of those who do.

²⁰ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 235, 20–29; 237, 16–17.

²¹ See de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 521, note.

²² See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.1, 40–41. For de Sacy's and Fleischer's views on compounds such as *ḥīna'iḍin* and *yawma'iḍin*, see de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 412, 1–4 and Fleischer, *Schriften* I.1, 322–323. Nöldeke agrees with Fleischer that the ending of *ḥīna'iḍin* and *yawma'iḍin* is a *tanwīn*. See Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 63, §53. Unlike Fleischer and Nöldeke, Reckendorf believes that in these compounds the ending is not a *tanwīn* but the word *'in* (*'inna*), which has been preserved as *'in* (a conditional particle meaning 'if' and a negation particle meaning 'not') and which draws attention to what follows it. See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 745, note.

4.3.1. 'Idan ends with tanwīn, it is the accusative of 'id and is thus *baṣīṭa* 'simple', not compound

Al-Xalīl, the author of the first Arabic dictionary known to us, briefly defines 'idān next to his definitions of 'id and 'idā. He appears to consider 'idān as the accusative form of 'id, that is 'id with *tanwīn*.²³ Moreover, al-Xalīl does not mention 'idān at all in his discussion of the root 'ḏn,²⁴ proving that he does not perceive the *nūn* of 'idān as part of its root.

4.3.2. 'Idan ends with tanwīn and it has developed from 'idā followed by a verb, the tanwīn being a compensation for the omission of this verb
Ibn Hišām mentions this opinion, which al-Astarābādī accepts as well (see §3.3 above and notes 19–20 there).

4.3.3. 'Idan is an independent word, its root is 'ḏn and it is thus *baṣīṭa* 'simple'

Ibn Jinnī, al-Zamaxšarī and Ibn Ya'īš do not explicitly discuss the etymology of 'idān, but from their remarks on its *waqf* form it can be inferred that they consider 'idān an independent word.²⁵

4.3.4. 'Idan is a compound of 'id and 'an and is thus *murakkaba* 'compound'

No grammarian holds this opinion, but al-'Ukbarī and Ibn al-Ḥāḡib attribute it to al-Xalīl, and al-'Ukbarī rejects it.²⁶ Some secondary sources express their support of it (see §4.4.1 and §4.4.3 below, devoted to de Sacy and Reckendorf, respectively).

4.4. Secondary sources

The secondary sources can be divided into two groups for the present purpose: some do not discuss this question at all, probably because they suppose that 'idān is an independent word, and that no etymological

²³ See al-Xalīl, 'Ayn VIII, 204, –3–2. For the full quotation and its analysis, see §5.3.1.

²⁴ See al-Xalīl, 'Ayn VIII, 199ff.

²⁵ Ibn Jinnī (see Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* II, 680) says that the last consonant of 'idān belongs to the 'aṣl 'root' of the word. Al-Zamaxšarī and Ibn Ya'īš express a similar opinion. See al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 173, 9–11; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 1396, 23–1397, 7. See also al-'Ukbarī, *Tibyān* I, 68; 183; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 30.

²⁶ See al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 34; Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, *Kāfiya* (1979) II, 238, 21. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, 'Aṣbāḥ (1975) II, 238, 6–8, where the author mentions this opinion without attributing it to a specific grammarian.

discussion is thus needed; others who discuss the etymology of *'idān* provide various explanations. Here is a short survey of scholars' opinions.

4.4.1. *De Sacy*

De Sacy maintains that in addition to the simple adverb *'id*, i.e. the accusative form of *'id*, which has no syntactic effect on the mood of the following verb, there also exists a second adverb *'idān* which is a compound of *'id* and *'an* and means *'id kāna kaḍā yakūnu 'an* 'if [the matter] is so, then'. In his view, it is the latter adverb that induces the following verb to take *naṣb*. In other words, when *'idān* has no syntactic effect on the following verb, it is the accusative form of *'id*, and when such an effect is to be found, *'idān* is a contraction of *'id* and *'an*, the first and last words of the above-mentioned sentence, the other elements of this sentence being omitted.²⁷

4.4.2. *Fleischer*

Fleischer criticizes de Sacy's theory in strong terms, and refutes it with several arguments, among them the following three:²⁸

- a. In Arabic there is no other known case of a conditional clause contracting so that its first and last words are retained, a process that de Sacy posits here.
- b. No grammarian explains the etymology of *'idān* in this way.
- c. De Sacy unjustly attributes to *'id* the meaning of *'in*.

Fleischer believes that *'idān* is always the accusative form of *'id*, which never appears in the nominative case (see §3.4 above).²⁹

4.4.3. *Reckendorf*

Reckendorf, like de Sacy and unlike Fleischer, regards the suffix *-an* of *'idān* as a remainder of *'an* and not as *tanwīn*. He states that just as *lan* is a compound of *lā* and *'an*, so *'idān* is a compound of *'id* and *'an*, with the meaning 'then'. He adds that *'idān* is essentially an emphatic form of *'id* and notes that one cannot posit *tanwīn* in a word of such a strong absolute

²⁷ See de Sacy, *Grammaire* II, 30–31, note.

²⁸ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 541–542.

²⁹ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.1, 40–41. Cf. Ewald, *Grammar* II, 118, note.

meaning. According to him, ʾidān (as well as ʾidin) could have changed into forms with *tanwīn*, but were not created as such.³⁰

4.4.4. *Gaudefroy-Demombynes and Blachère*

Gaudefroy-Demombynes and Blachère mention the two previously noted hypotheses concerning the origin of the suffix *-an* of ʾidān: *tanwīn* and a remainder of ʾan. They support the former explanation and subsequently claim that Arab grammarians adopted the second, and thus invented examples in which a verb in *naṣb* follows ʾidān.³¹ They come to an erroneous conclusion because of erroneous assumptions. First, it is not the case that Arab grammarians as a whole adopted the etymological explanation of ʾidān as a compound of ʾid and ʾan, as shown in §4.3 and especially in §4.3.4 above; in fact, only a few grammarians mention this explanation, none of them supports it and some explicitly reject it. Secondly, the claim that Arab grammarians invented the examples in which a verb in *naṣb* follows ʾidān, cannot be proven, and in fact contradicts the fact that in the Qurʾān, ancient poetry and other corpora, there are instances of ʾidān followed by a verb in *naṣb*.³²

4.4.5. *Aartun*

Aartun argues that the *-n* at the end of ʾidān is neither *tanwīn* nor a remainder of ʾan, but an emphatic suffix.³³ In his article on the etymology of *lan* (Aartun, *Lan*; discussed in chapter 2, §2.4.2), Aartun explains the ending of *lan* in the same way.

4.4.6. *Ḥasan*

Ḥasan, in his very comprehensive *al-Naḥw al-wāfi*, states that ʾidān is an independent word, derived from the root ʾdn and thus *basīṭa*. He rejects out of hand all attempts to explain it as a compound of ʾid+ʾan.³⁴

³⁰ See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 745, 7–10 and note.

³¹ See Gaudefroy-Demombynes-Blachère, *Grammaire*, 458 and note 1, respectively.

³² In addition to examples from the Qurʾān and ancient poetry mentioned in this chapter (for the former, see especially §8), there are relevant examples from al-Mubarrad's *al-Kāmil* and from the *Ḥamāsa*, which Reckendorf quotes. See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 745–746 (§243); Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 456–457 (§225).

³³ ʾida-n (Stammwort + hervorhebendem *-n*). See Aartun, *Particles*, 5. Aartun subsequently mentions (*ibid.*, 63) that a similar usage of this emphasizing *-n* exists in other Semitic languages, such as Ugaritic and Aramaic.

³⁴ See Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 308, 4–6 and note 2.

4.5. *Summary*

Grammarians and modern scholars mention several possible etymologies of *'idan*. The main question in this respect is whether *'idan* is related to the words *'id* and *'idā* which convey meanings related to 'time' or is an independent word derived from the root *'dn*. As mentioned in §2.5, it seems that the original spelling is إِذًا, as the (adverbial) accusative form of إِذٍ.

5. THE GRAMMARIANS' DEFINITION OF *'IDAN* AND ITS MEANING

The grammarians have various definitions of *'idan* and its meaning. In their explanations they use the three fundamental technical terms *jawāb*, *jazā'* and *mukāfa'a* (a synonym of *jazā'*). These are explained in appendix A, §§6–7. According to most grammarians, *'idan* has the meanings of *jawāb* and *jazā'* (*mukāfa'a*); they disagree mainly on whether *'idan* always has these meanings or only in some of the contexts in which it occurs.

5.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi does not define *'idan* in chapter 237, that is devoted to this word. In a different chapter of the *Kitāb*, chapter 508 in which various nouns and particles are briefly defined, Sībawayhi says: *wa'ammā 'idan fajawābun wajazā'un* 'as for *'idan*, it is a *jawāb* and a *jazā'*'.³⁵ From his first sentence in chapter 237 we may infer that in his view *'idan* does not always indicate a *jawāb*: *i'lam 'anna 'idan 'idā kānat jawāban. . .* 'know that when *'idan* is a *jawāb. . .*'.³⁶

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

At the beginning of his discussion of *'idan*, al-Farrā' notes that when it induces the following verb to take *naṣb*, it appears as a *jawāb*.³⁷

5.3. *Other grammarians*

In this section al-Xalīl's view is discussed separately from those of other grammarians, both because of the importance of the former's definition of *'idan* and because this definition differs from those of other grammarians.

³⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* II, 339, 9–10.

³⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 365, 6. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1973) II, 153, 2; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 78, 16.

³⁷ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 273, 7–8. Cf. Beck, *'Idan*, 432 (§a).

5.3.1. *Al-Xalīl's definition*

Al-Xalīl briefly defines ʾidan together with ʾid and ʾidā, as follows: ʾid *limā maḍā waqaḍ yakūnu limā yastaqbilu waʾidā limā yastaqbilu waʾidan jawābun tawkīdu l-šarṭi yunawwanu fī l-ittiṣāl wayuskanu fī l-waqf* ʾid [is used to express] what has gone (i.e. actions in the past) and sometimes [also to express] what will occur (i.e. actions in the future); ʾidā [is used to express] what will occur; and ʾidan is a *jawāb*, an emphasis of a conditional clause, which ends in *tanwīn* in the *ittiṣāl* 'non-pausal form' (i.e. إِذَا) and in a *sukūn* in the *waqf* 'pausal form' (i.e. إِذًا, a form which ends with a long vowel -ā, considered in Arabic grammar as a zero vowel).³⁸ He subsequently discusses the compounds *yawmaʾidin* 'at that day' and *sāʾataʾidin* 'at that hour', which like ʾidan are compounds ending in *tanwīn*, although its case here is *jarr*.³⁹

Al-Xalīl's definition of ʾidan is interesting in several aspects. First, he attributes to it not only the meaning of *jawāb*, as other grammarians do, but also the meaning of *tawkīd al-šarṭ* which few other grammarians mention (see §5.3.3 below). Secondly, al-Xalīl does not refer at all to the possibility that ʾidan may induce the following verb to take *naṣb*. This seems to me of great significance for the question of the historical development in the status of ʾidan as an *ʾamil* affecting the following verb (see the discussion in §9). Thirdly, al-Xalīl, like al-Farrā' and unlike other grammarians, does not refer at all to the meaning of *jazā'*.

5.3.2. *Other grammarians' definitions*

Most grammarians and lexicographers define ʾidan exactly as Sibawayhi does: ʾidan *jawābun wajazāʾun*.⁴⁰ Al-Jawharī and al-Fayyūmī define ʾidan as *ḥarf mukāfaʾa wajawāb*.⁴¹

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that ʾidan does not always indicate a *jawāb*.⁴² As for *jazā'*, most grammarians also agree that ʾidan does not always denote it. Ibn al-Ḥāḍib in his *Kāfiya* states that ʾidan usually consists of the meaning of *jazā'*, but not always. Al-Astarābādī in his commentary explains that there are instances in which ʾidan does not have

³⁸ See al-Xalīl, *ʾAyn VIII*, 204, -3--2.

³⁹ See al-Xalīl, *ʾAyn VIII*, 204, -1ff. Cf. §3.4.

⁴⁰ See, for example, Ibn Sida, *Muxaṣṣaṣ XIV*, 59, 20--21; al-Zamaxṣarī, *ʾUnmūdaj*, 114, 12; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ II*, 925, 20; 1216, 19; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, 7--8; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XIII, 13b, 8; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1848), 22, 21; al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 195--196; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1889) IX, 121. For a clear explanation of this definition, see al-Zamaxṣarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 151, 13--14. Cf. Sadan, *Jawāb*, §III.1.

⁴¹ See al-Jawharī, *Tāj II*, 352, 2; al-Fayyūmī, *Miṣbāḥ I*, 10.

⁴² See, for example, al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb II*, 34; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ II*, 1216, 24.

the meaning of a condition, as in the verse *fa'altuhā 'īdan wa'anā mina l-ḡāllina* 'Well, I did it, being of those that stray' (Qur'ān 26:19).⁴³ He adds that when *'īdan* has the meaning of a condition, this can be either unreal (referring to the past) as in the sentence *law ji'tanī 'īdan la'akramtuka* 'had you come to me, I would have honored you', or real (referring to the future) as in the sentence *'īdan 'ukrimaka* 'I will therefore honor you'.⁴⁴ However, when *'īdan* appears before a verb which denotes an action in the present, as in the sentence *'īdan 'aẓunnuka kāḏiban* 'I therefore think that you are lying', the conditional meaning is impossible.⁴⁵

Ibn Hišām in his *Muġnī* summarizes the varying opinions on the meaning of *'īdan*: Sībawayhi says that *'īdan* has the meanings of *jawāb* and *jazā'*; al-Šalawbīn contends that both meanings are always found in *'īdan*, while al-Fārisī maintains that *'īdan* has these meanings in most cases only, since there are instances in which it does not have the meaning of *jazā'*, e.g. when the following verb indicates an action in the present (this corresponds to al-Astarābādī's view explained above). In addition, *'īdan* usually has the meaning of *jawāb* to one of the conditional particles *'in* and *law* 'if', whether they appear in the literal utterance (*ẓāhirataynī*) or in the *taqdīr* structure concealed in the speaker's mind (*muqaddarataynī*).⁴⁶

5.3.3. *The meaning of tawkīd al-šarṭ 'emphasis of the conditional clause'*

As mentioned in §5.3.1 above, al-Xalīl maintains that *'īdan* has the meaning not only of *jawāb*, as do other grammarians, but also of *tawkīd al-šarṭ*. Here are the opinions of the few grammarians and lexicographers who also attribute to *'īdan* this latter meaning:

- a. Al-Astarābādī explains that one of the usages of *'īdan* (in addition to contexts in which it induces the following verb to take *naṣb*) is in conditional sentences beginning with one of the conditional particles *law* or *'in*. Its purpose in this usage, he adds, is to strengthen these two

⁴³ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 2–9. Cf. Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 541, where the author understands *'īdan* as *nun denn, nun ja* (*da es einmal so ist*); Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 64, 6–9, where it is claimed that the meaning of *'īdan* in this verse is *zu der Zeit*, unlike its other occurrences in the Qur'ān, in which it means *in dem Falle*. My translation follows Fleischer's analysis.

⁴⁴ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 9–11.

⁴⁵ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 5 last lines. This sentence type is discussed in §6.1.3.3 and §6.4.6.

⁴⁶ See Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* (1995), 30–31. See also Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1848), 22, 21–23; al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān* (1857), 347, 11–13. Cf. Howell, *Grammar* III, 657, 3–11.

conditional particles (*tawkīdan lahumā*). His examples are *law zurtanī ʾidan laʾakramtuka* 'had you visited me, I would have honored you' and *ʾin jīʾtanī ʾidan ʾazurka* 'if you come to me, I will visit you'.⁴⁷

- b. In his *ʾItqān*, al-Suyūṭī quotes an anonymous grammarian who claims that the usages of *ʾidan* can be divided into two kinds: in one it has a syntactic effect on the following verb, and in the other it has no such effect. Here is this important paragraph in full:⁴⁸

*Waqāla ǧayruhu ʾidan nawʿāni l-ʾawwalu ʾan tadulla ʾalā ʾinšāʾi l-sababīyyati wal-šarṭi biḥayṭu lā yuḥṣamu l-irtibāṭu min ǧayriḥā naḥwu ʾazūruka fataqūlu ʾidan ʾukrimaka wahiya fī ḥādā l-wajhi ʾāmilatun tadxulu ʾalā l-jumlati l-fīʾliyyati fatanṣibu l-muḍārīʾa l-mustaqbila l-muttaṣila ʾidā ṣadarat wal-tānī ʾan takūna muʾakkidatan liǧawābinʾ rtabaṭa bimūqaddamin ʾaw munabbihatan ʾalā sababin ḥaṣala fī l-ḥālī wahiya ḥīnaʾidin ǧayru ʾāmilatin liʾanna l-muʾakkidāti lā yuʾtamuḍu ʾalayḥā wal-ʾāmila yuʾtamuḍu ʾalayhi naḥwu ʾin taʾtinī ʾidan ʾātika [sic] wawallāhi ʾidan laʾafʾalanna ʾalā tarā ʾannahā law saqaṭat lafuhima l-irtibāṭu [Another grammarian] other than him (i.e. other than Ibn Hišām mentioned before) said: [the usages of] ʾidan [can be divided] into two kinds: the first is that it indicates a connection [to what has been previously said] (for *sababīyya*, see appendix A, §12) and [a meaning of] a condition, so that the connection [between what precedes and what follows it] cannot be understood without it, as in the example [in which someone tells you] ʾazūruka 'I will visit you' and you say [in response] ʾidan ʾukrimaka 'I will therefore honor you'. In this kind it (i.e. ʾidan) functions as an ʾāmil, joins the verbal sentence and induces the following verb to take *naṣb*, when it (i.e. ʾidan) introduces the utterance. The second [kind of ʾidan] emphasizes a *ǧawāb* related to what has been previously said or draws attention to a connection occurring in the present. [In this kind] it (i.e. ʾidan) does not function as an ʾāmil, because there is no syntactic connection with the emphasizing elements, whereas such a connection is found with the ʾāmil. Examples [of the second kind] are: ʾin taʾtinī ʾidan ʾātika (the original has ʾātika)⁴⁹ 'if you come to me, then I will come to you' and wallāhi ʾidan laʾafʾalanna 'by God, I shall indeed do [it].' Do you not see that [even] had it (i.e. ʾidan of the second kind) been omitted [from these examples], the connection [between what precedes and what follows it] would have [still] been understood?'*

⁴⁷ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 16–24.

⁴⁸ See al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1857), 347, 22–348, 8. Cf. al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* I, 15a, 12–18, where the same explanation is cited without specifying its origin.

⁴⁹ Since *ʾidan* here has no syntactic effect on the following verb which introduces the apodosis, its mood should be *ǧazm*. Cf. note 57 below.

6. HOW AND UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS 'IDAN INFLUENCES THE FOLLOWING VERB

6.1. *Sibawayhi*

In chapter 237 *Sibawayhi* discusses the sentence types in which '*idan* induces the following verb to take *naṣb* and the necessary conditions for this syntactic influence. Here are his views on these subjects.

6.1.1. *The primary conditions for the syntactic influence of 'idan*

At the beginning of chapter 237 *Sibawayhi* says that there are two primary conditions for '*idan* to be able to influence the following verb: '*idan* has to be a *jawāb* and it has to introduce the utterance.⁵⁰

6.1.2. *The analogy to the verbs which belong to the category of 'af'āl al-šakk wal-yaqīn*

As Beck indicates in his article,⁵¹ *Sibawayhi* uses the analogy between '*idan* and '*urā* 'I think' in order to explain the syntactic effect of the former: '*idan* influences the following verb as '*urā* influences the following nouns, when it introduces the utterance.⁵² *Sibawayhi* uses this analogy throughout chapter 237 in order to explain some characteristics of '*idan* and its syntactic influence. These are presented in the following sections.

6.1.2.1. *The possible separation between 'idan and the verb it influences* Of the '*awāmil* which cause the following verb to take *naṣb*, '*idan* is the only one which can be separated from this verb. The separation that *Sibawayhi* refers to is the oath *wallāhi* 'by God'. According to him, just as it is possible to separate '*urā* and the following nouns which it influences, so is a similar separation possible between '*idan* and the following verb which it influences. The example '*idan wallāhi 'ajī'aka* 'by God, I will therefore come to you' is thus parallel to the example '*urā wallāhi Zaydan fā'ilan* 'I think, by God, that Zayd is doing [something]'.⁵³

⁵⁰ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 365, 6; 365, 9–10.

⁵¹ See Beck, '*Idan*, 436 (beginning of part II).

⁵² See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 365, 6–7. In the same context, *Sibawayhi* later mentions the verb *ḥasibtu* 'I thought', which like '*urā* belongs to the category of the '*af'āl al-šakk wal-yaqīn*. See *ibid.*, 365, 14–17.

⁵³ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 365, 7–14.

6.1.2.2. 'Idan after the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-* When a conjunction precedes 'idan,⁵⁴ two sentence types are possible: in one 'idan has a syntactic influence and in the other it does not. These two are parallel to the two sentence types in which one of the objects of 'urā precedes it. Sībawayhi demonstrates this by the two examples *fa'idan 'ātiyaka* 'and I will therefore come to you' and *wa'idan lā 'ajrūka* 'and I will therefore not come to you' which are parallel to the two examples *Zaydan ḥasibtu 'axāka* and *Zaydun ḥasibtu 'axūka* (both mean 'I thought that Zayd is your brother'). In the first example of each pair the syntactic influence exists, whereas in the second it does not. To exemplify the syntactic influence of 'idan in this context, Sībawayhi quotes Qur'ān 17:76 with the reading of the relevant verb with *naṣb*: *wa'idan lā yalbatū xalfaka 'illā qalīlan*; and as an example of 'idan with no syntactic influence, he quotes Qur'ān 4:53, in which the verb following 'idan is *marfū'*: *fa'idan lā yu'tūna l-nāsa naqīran*.⁵⁵

6.1.2.3. 'Idan situated between the verb and an element in the sentence to which the verb is syntactically connected When 'idan is situated between the verb and an element in the sentence to which the verb is syntactically connected, its syntactic influence is canceled and it does not induce the following verb to take *naṣb*, exactly as 'urā does not cause the following noun to take *naṣb* when it is situated between a noun and a verb or when 'inna introduces the sentence. Sībawayhi adds that this explanation is due to al-Xalīl and says that the example *'anā 'idan 'ātika* 'I will therefore come to you' is parallel to the examples *kāna 'urā Zaydun dāhiban* 'I thought that Zayd went' and *'innī 'urā dāhibun* 'I think that I am going'. In all these examples, 'idan and 'urā are situated between elements which are syntactically connected and this explains the lack of their syntactic influence.⁵⁶ In the same way Sībawayhi explains an example in which 'idan introduces the apodosis and has no syntactic influence: *'in ta'tinī 'idan 'ātika*.⁵⁷ In this example the verb following 'idan is syntactically connected to what precedes it (the protasis), and it therefore takes *jazm* and is not induced by 'idan to take *naṣb*.⁵⁸ This is also how he

⁵⁴ In Sībawayhi's formulation: when 'idan is situated between *fa-* or *wa-* and the verb.

⁵⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 365, 14–20. Both Qur'ānic verses, as well as a third that is relevant in this respect, are explained in §8 below.

⁵⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 365, 20–366, 1.

⁵⁷ In the Derenbourg edition the form is 'ātika (in *raf'*), whereas the *Bulāq* edition has 'ātika (in *jazm*). See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 1 and Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* (*Bulāq*) I, 411, 15, respectively. It seems to me that the latter is correct. Cf. note 49 above.

⁵⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 1–2.

explains the lack of influence of *'iḍan* in examples introduced by an oath, e.g. *wallāhi 'iḍan lā 'af'alu* 'by God, I will therefore not do [something]' (*'iḍan* has no influence since the verb *'af'alu* is syntactically connected to *wallāhi*); and on the other hand, the influence of *'iḍan* where it, and not the oath, introduces the sentence, as in the synonymous example *'iḍan wallāhi lā 'af'ala* (*'iḍan* has influence since the verb *lā 'af'ala* is syntactically connected with it and not with *wallāhi*).⁵⁹ Sibawayhi ends this discussion by quoting a relevant line of poetry: *urdud ḥimāraka lā tunza' sawiyyatuhu / 'iḍan yuradda waqaydu l-'ayri makrūbu* 'curb your donkey, and what is put under its saddle will not be removed. Therefore, it will be returned, while the strap of the beast is strengthened'.⁶⁰ Sibawayhi explains that *'iḍan* in this case induces the following verb to take *naṣb*, because it introduces an utterance which is not connected to the utterance preceding it, this latter being a complete, independent sentence.⁶¹

6.1.3. Other sentence types

Subsequently in chapter 237 Sibawayhi introduces other sentence types with *'iḍan* and explains them. These are presented in the following sections.

6.1.3.1. *A conditional clause of the type 'in ta'tinī 'ātika wa'iḍan 'ukrimka / 'ukrimaka / 'ukrimuka* In this type of sentence the mood of the verb following *wa'iḍan* can be *jazm*, *naṣb* or *raf'*. If the sentence *'ātika wa'iḍan 'ukrimka* is considered simple and not two separate sentences joined by *wāw al-'atf*, the verb following *wa'iḍan* has the same syntactic status as the verb preceding it (*'ātika*), both belonging to the apodosis, and thus both taking *jazm*. If, on the other hand, the *wāw* in *wa'iḍan* is deemed to connect two separate sentences, the verb following *wa'iḍan* can take either *naṣb* or *raf'*, this case being the above-mentioned in §6.1.2.2. Sibawayhi notes that his teacher Yūnus preferred *raf'* in this sentence type.⁶²

6.1.3.2. A sentence type in which the subject follows *'iḍan* directly

According to Sibawayhi, in this sentence type the only possible mood is

⁵⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 5–8.

⁶⁰ A verse in the *baṣīṭ* meter, by Ibn 'Anama l-Ḍabbī. See Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 18a, 12. For the explanation of the verse, see al-Sīrāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 100, 9–101, 2; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 411; Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān* (1956) I, 713a, 7ff.; XIII, 14–15; al-Baġdādī, *Xizāna* (1979) VIII, 462–473. Cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 10, note 3.

⁶¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 2–5. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1973) II, 153, 10–16; al-Sīrāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 100, 5–101, 2; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 132, 11–133, 2.

⁶² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 12–15.

raf', as in *'idan* 'Abdu llāhi yaqūlu dālika 'therefore 'Abdallāh will say that'. He compares *'idan* here with *'innamā* and *hal*, since the noun after all three is always in a state of *ibtidā'*, i.e. not influenced by any *'āmil lafẓiyy*.⁶³

6.1.3.3. *A sentence in which the verb following 'idan conveys an action in the present and thus takes raf'* Two examples of this sentence type are *'idan* 'azunnuhu fā'ilan 'I therefore think that he is doing' and *'idan* 'azunnuhu kādiban 'I therefore think that he is lying', the latter being uttered after hearing a story. Sibawayhi explains that the fact that the verb indicates an action in the present prevents *'idan* from syntactically affecting it to take *naṣb*, exactly as the verb after the sisters of *'idan* (the particles *'an*, *lan* and *kay*, which, like *'idan*, induce the following verb to take *naṣb*) cannot indicate an action in the present.⁶⁴ However, the verb takes *naṣb* if the speaker's intention in these verbs is to denote an action in the future, as in *'idan* 'azunnaka 'I will therefore think that you are ...',⁶⁵ or an action in the present which will continue in the future, as in *'idan* yaḍribaka 'he therefore hits you and will continue hitting you'.⁶⁶

6.2. *Al-Farrā'*

6.2.1. *The primary conditions for the syntactic influence of 'idan* Al-Farrā', like Sibawayhi, mentions the same two conditions for the syntactic influence of *'idan* on the following verb (see §6.1.1).⁶⁷

6.2.2. *The analogy to the verbs which belong to the category of the 'af'al al-šakk wal-yaqin*

While Sibawayhi, as Beck notes in his article,⁶⁸ uses the analogy between *'idan* and *'urā* to explain the syntactic effect of the former in a number of different sentence types, al-Farrā' uses it to explain one sentence type only: where *'idan* is between the subject and the predicate.⁶⁹ Furthermore, contrary to Sibawayhi's position, that *'urā* can influence its two objects

⁶³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 15–18. This is the common meaning of the technical term *al-ibtidā'*. See appendix A, §4.1.1, note 36.

⁶⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 20–24.

⁶⁵ The second object of the main verb is missing and should be completed according to the previous examples: *'idan* 'azunnaka fā'ilan 'I will therefore think that you are doing'. Cf. Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 20–21.

⁶⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 25–367, 1.

⁶⁷ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 273, 7–8 and II, 338, 3–4. Cf. Beck, *'Idan*, 432 (§a) and 434 (§k).

⁶⁸ See Beck, *'Idan*, 436 (beginning of part II).

⁶⁹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 338. Cf. Beck, *'Idan*, 434 (§l).

when it is between them (see §6.1.2.2), al-Farrā' states that 'urā influences its two objects only when it introduces the sentence.⁶⁹ This difference in their views on 'urā also causes them to offer different explanations for the two possibilities of *raf'* and *naṣb* after *wa'idan* or *fa'idan* (see §6.1.2.2 above and §6.2.4 below).

6.2.3. *The analogy to jawāb al-qasam*

In his discussion of the sentence type in which 'idan is between the subject and the predicate and thus has no syntactic influence, al-Farrā' uses an additional analogy which Sibawayhi does not mention: to a *jawāb al-qasam* introduced by the particle *la-*. This *la-* introduces the *jawāb al-qasam* only when the utterance begins with *al-qasam*, as in the example *wallāhi 'innaka la'āqilun* 'by God, you are intelligent', and not when *wallāhi* appears between the noun and its predicate or follows them both, as in the examples with the similar meaning 'anta wallāhi 'āqilun and 'anta 'āqilun wallāhi, respectively. Al-Farrā' explains that 'idan's lack of influence when located between the subject and the predicate is parallel to the non-occurrence of the particle *la-* in the *jawāb al-qasam* when *wallāhi* appears between the noun and its predicate.⁶⁹

6.2.4. *The occurrence of 'idan after the conjunctions fa- and wa-*

Al-Farrā' explains this sentence type in a totally different way than Sibawayhi. First, Sibawayhi mentions only *fa-* and *wa-*, while al-Farrā' states that any conjunction (in his words, *hurūf al-nasq*) is possible, for example *tumma* and 'aw.⁷⁰ Secondly, al-Farrā' explains this sentence type using the theory of *taqdīr*: 'idan can be considered either as introducing the *taqdīr* utterance (although the literal utterance has *fa'idan*, *wa'idan* and the like), in which case 'idan has a syntactic influence, or as appearing later in the *taqdīr* utterance, and having no syntactic influence. In the latter case a protasis is added after the conjunction and 'idan is conceived as appearing at the end of the utterance. This is how al-Farrā' explains the *raf'* mood of the verb in *fa'idan lā yu'tūna* (Qur'an 4:53), saying that its *taqdīr* structure is *wala'in kāna lahum 'aw walaw kāna lahum naṣībun lā yu'tūna l-nāsa 'idan naqīran* 'and if they had or had they had a part [in the kingdom], they would not give or they would have not given men even

⁷⁰ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 273, 9–12. Cf. Beck, 'Idan, 432–433 (§b); Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 176.

the minimum'. He gives a similar explanation for the *rafʿ* mood of the verb *yalbaṭūna* in Qurʾān 17:76 (with the reading with *rafʿ*).⁷¹

6.2.5. 'Idan which introduces the apodosis

This sentence type, like the previous one, is also explained differently by al-Farrā'. While Sibawayhi admits only *jazm* in sentences of this type, for example *'in ta'tinī 'idan 'ātika* (see §6.1.2.3 and note 58), al-Farrā' states that all three moods are possible after *'idan* in this sentence type and explains them using the theory of *taqdīr*.⁷²

6.3. Comparison between Sibawayhi and al-Farrā'

As Beck indicates in his article,⁷³ some sentence types with *'idan* are mentioned by only one of the two grammarians. The following is a concise description of these cases.

6.3.1. Sentence types which Sibawayhi analyzes and al-Farrā' does not

There are four such types, treated in §6.1.2.1, §6.1.3.1, §6.1.3.2 and §6.1.3.3.

6.3.2. Sentence types which al-Farrā' analyzes and Sibawayhi does not

6.3.2.1. *Sentence types introduced by the particle 'inna* Al-Farrā' states that in this sentence type both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* are possible, as in *'innī 'idan 'ūdika/'ūdiyaka* 'I will therefore hurt you'.⁷⁴ As another example for a sentence with *naṣb* he quotes the following line of poetry: *lā tatrukannī fihim ṣaṭīrā / 'innī 'idan 'ahlīka 'aw 'aṭīrā* 'do not leave me among them as a stranger. I will therefore die or fly'.⁷⁵

6.3.2.2. *Lām al-ta'kid following 'idan* Al-Farrā' explains the occurrence of *lām al-ta'kid* following *'idan* using a *taqdīr* structure containing *la'in*, *wallāhi* or *law*. The example he cites is the verse *mā ttaxaḍa llāhu min waladīn wamā kāna ma'ahu min 'ilāhin 'idan laḍahaba kullu 'ilāhin bimā xalaqa* 'God has not taken a son, nor is there any [other] god with him. [If there had been several gods,] every god would have then gone

⁷¹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 273, 9–14. Cf. Beck, *'Idan*, 432–433 (§§b–c and §i); Kāẓim, *Naḥw*, 80, 11–16.

⁷² See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 274, 4. Cf. Beck, *'Idan*, 434 (§f).

⁷³ See Beck, *'Idan*, 437, §1.

⁷⁴ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 274. Cf. Beck, *'Idan*, 433 (§h).

⁷⁵ The author of this verse, in the *rajaz* meter, is unknown. See Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 110b, 16.

with what he had created' (Qur'ān 23:93). Its *taqdīr* structure, according to al-Farrā', is *law kāna fihā 'ilāhun laḍahaba kullu 'ilāhin bimā xalaqa* 'if there had been [another] god in it (*al-samā* 'the sky?'), every god would have gone with what he had created'.⁷⁶

6.4. Other grammarians

6.4.1. The primary conditions for the syntactic influence of 'īdan

Some grammarians mention Sībawayhi's two primary conditions for 'īdan to have syntactic influence (see §6.1.1),⁷⁷ whereas others add two further conditions which can also be inferred from Sībawayhi's views on 'īdan: that the verb should not be syntactically connected to another element in the sentence (preceding 'īdan) and that the verb should indicate a future action.⁷⁸

6.4.2. The analogy to the verbs which belong to the category of the 'af'āl al-šakk wal-yaqīn

Some grammarians use this analogy,⁷⁹ but unlike Sībawayhi and in line with al-Farrā', they do not use it in order to clarify all the sentence types which Sībawayhi does, but only those in which 'īdan is situated between the verb and an element in the sentence with which the verb is syntactically connected (see §6.1.2.3 and §6.2.2).⁸⁰

As for the sentence type in which an oath separates 'īdan from the following verb, but the latter is still influenced by the former, some grammarians add similar sentence types, not mentioned by Sībawayhi, in which there is a separation between 'īdan and the following verb, but the former still has a syntactic influence on the latter:

- a. Al-'Ukbarī mentions that not only separation by an oath, but also by the negation particle *lā*, does not cancel the influence of 'īdan.⁸¹

⁷⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 274. Cf. Beck, 'Idan, 433 (§g); Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 141.

⁷⁷ See, for example, al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 116, 1–3.

⁷⁸ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, 'Uṣūl (1973) II, 153, 2–3; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 78, 16–18; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 352, 2–6; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 151, 13–19; al-Zamaxšārī, 'Unmūdaj, 114, 12–15; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 1216, 24–1217, 1; Ibn al-Ḥāḍib, *Kāfiya* (1979) II, 237, 22–28; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 3; al-Suyūṭī, *Itqān* (1857), 347, 15–16.

⁷⁹ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 10, 1–7; 11, 7–10; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 116, 17–117, 2; Ibn al-Sarrāj, 'Uṣūl (1973) II, 153, 5–16; 154, 3–9; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 205, 1–7; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 352, 5–6; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 35–36.

⁸⁰ One exception is Ibn al-Sarrāj, who follows Sībawayhi's method. For references, see previous note.

⁸¹ See al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 36.

- b. Al-Astarābādī states that in addition to an oath, only a *duʿā* ‘invocation’ or a *nidā* ‘vocative’ could separate ʾidan from the following verb without causing the former to lose its influence on the latter.⁸²
- c. Ibn Mālik says that in addition to an oath and the negation particle *lā*, which do not cancel the influence of ʾidan, some grammarians allowed a separation also by a *ẓarf*, i.e. an adverbial accusative of time and place.⁸³
- d. In contrast to al-Astarābādī, Ibn Hišām states that separation by a *nidā* cancels the influence of ʾidan on the verb. He adds that only a separation by an oath or *lā* does not do so.⁸⁴ An example of the former which he quotes is the line of poetry *ʾidan wallāhi narṁiyahum biḥarbin / tušibu l-ṭifla min qabli l-mašibi* ‘We will therefore, by God, launch against them a war which will cause the child’s hair to whiten before the time of old age’.⁸⁵ In reference to the views of some grammarians on the possible separators between ʾidan and the following verb, Ibn Hišām says that Ibn ʿUṣfūr allowed separation by *ẓarf*, Ibn Bābašād allowed separation by *duʿā* and *nidā*, and al-Kisāʾī and Hišām allowed any separation by what is syntactically influenced by the verb (*maʿmūl al-fiʿl*), such as direct objects and adverbial accusatives; however, in such cases al-Kisāʾī preferred to have ʾidan maintain its influence, thus putting the verb in *naṣb*, whereas Hišām preferred *rafʿ*.⁸⁶

6.4.3. The occurrence of ʾidan following the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*

Grammarians agree that in this sentence type the verb can take either *rafʿ* or *naṣb*, but like Sībawayhi and al-Farrāʾ, who have different explanations for these two options, there are also various explanations among later grammarians for these two possible moods.

Al-Axfaš recognizes that both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* are possible, and explains the former not only as due to the syntactic connection of the verb with a former element in the sentence, in this case the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-* (Sībawayhi uses a similar explanation in another context; see §6.1.2.3), but also provides a *taqdīr* structure in which ʾidan follows the verb (al-Farrāʾ

⁸² al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 237, 16–22.

⁸³ See Ibn Mālik, *Taṣḥīl*, 230, 6–7; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʿumda*, 332, 15–333, 1.

⁸⁴ See Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 31; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1848), 23, 2–7.

⁸⁵ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by Ḥassān. See Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 23b, 12. According to al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid*, 327–328 (Cf. Howell, *Grammar* III, 304, 1–3), it is Ḥassān b. Ṭābit. For Ibn Hišām’s citations of this verse, see Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 909; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1848), 22, 20; 23, 5.

⁸⁶ See Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 32. Cf. Howell, *Grammar* III, 660, 13–19; Yaʿqūb, *Ḥurūf*, 86a, 1–10.

uses a similar explanation in this context; see the end of §6.2.4).⁸⁷ Al-Mubarrad and Ibn Yaʿīš, on the other hand, explain the possibility of the *rafʿ* mood with another *taqdīr* structure, different from any mentioned so far. In this structure an independent pronoun appears between the conjunction and *ʾidān*, and causes the latter to lose its grammatical influence on the verb.⁸⁸

Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions the two possibilities, of *rafʿ* and *naṣb*, and follows Sibawayhi's explanations,⁸⁹ whereas other grammarians just mention the two possibilities with no further explanation.⁹⁰

6.4.4. *A conditional clause of the type 'in ta'tini 'ātika wa'idān 'ukrimka/ 'ukrimaka/'ukrimuka*

Most grammarians follow Sibawayhi's explanation of this sentence type (see §6.1.3.1). Some provide the same example as Sibawayhi,⁹¹ while others use a different example, which they explain in a similar way.⁹²

Ibn al-Anbārī is the only grammarian who maintains that in this sentence type *rafʿ* and *naṣb* alone are possible (but not *jazm*).⁹³

6.4.5. *A sentence in which the subject follows 'idān directly*

Some grammarians explain this sentence type in the same manner as Sibawayhi (see §6.1.3.2),⁹⁴ whereas others just mention it with no further explanation.⁹⁵

6.4.6. *A sentence in which the verb following 'idān conveys an action in the present and thus takes the rafʿ mood*

Most grammarians follow Sibawayhi's explanation of this sentence type (see §6.1.3.3), but do not mention the second possibility that Sibawayhi

⁸⁷ See al-Axfaš, *Maʿānī* (1985) I, 302, 5–12. Cf. al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 36, where only the first part is presented.

⁸⁸ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 12, 1–5; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 926, 2–4.

⁸⁹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1973) II, 154, 3–9.

⁹⁰ See, for example, al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 116, 13–17; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 195, 9–12; 204, 6–8; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 352, 6–7; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 151, 21–152, 1; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1951) I, 67, 7–9; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʿumda*, 332, 7–333, 2; Ibn ʿAqil, *Šarḥ*, 294, 9–10; al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1857), 347, 16–18.

⁹¹ See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 11, 11–12, 2; 12, 7–9; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Kāfiya* (1979) II, 239, 8–11.

⁹² See, for example, Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* (1995), 32. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1857), 347, 18–21, where the author quotes Ibn Hišām and his explanation.

⁹³ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 130, 17–22.

⁹⁴ See, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1973) II, 154, 13–14.

⁹⁵ See, for example, Ibn ʿAqil, *Šarḥ*, 294, 10–11.

refers to, in which the verb expresses an action in the present which continues in the future and therefore takes *naṣb*.⁹⁶ Others just mention this sentence type with no further explanation.⁹⁷

6.4.7. A sentence introduced by the particle 'inna

According to al-Zajjājī, in contrast to al-Farrā' (see §6.3.2.1), only *raf'* is possible for this sentence type, since 'idan is located between the verb and another element in the sentence with which the verb is syntactically connected. An example he provides for this sentence type is 'innī 'idan 'uḥsinu 'ilayka 'I will therefore benefit with you'.⁹⁸

6.4.8. Lām al-ta'kīd following 'idan

Al-Astarābādī rejects al-Farrā''s claim that *lām al-ta'kīd* following 'idan is to be explained by a *taqdīr* structure in which there is an oath (see §6.3.2.2). Instead, he argues that this *lām* appears when the utterance after 'idan conveys a condition in the past, and that in this context 'idan behaves syntactically as *law*, whose *jawāb* is introduced by *lām*.⁹⁹

7. IS THERE AN 'AN MUḌMARA AFTER 'IDAN?

The grammarians disagree on whether the verb following 'idan takes *naṣb* due to its direct influence or due to a following 'an muḍmara. The common opinion is that 'idan itself syntactically influences the following verb and that no 'an muḍmara is to be posited after it.

7.1. Sībawayhi

Sībawayhi argues that 'idan itself induces the following verb to take *naṣb*. He says that he had been informed that al-Xalīl posited an 'an muḍmara after it,¹⁰⁰ but that the explanation that he heard from al-Xalīl himself was different; we may therefore infer that Sībawayhi doubted whether the above-mentioned claim was indeed made by al-Xalīl. At any rate, Sībawayhi

⁹⁶ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 13, 1–3; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1973) II, 153, 17–154, 3; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 79, 1–2; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 352, 3–4; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣsal*, 151, 16–17; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Asrār*, 131, 1–4; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 37; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 926, 7–8; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 333, 4–6; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995), 32.

⁹⁷ See, for example, Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 294, 7–8; al-Širbīnī, *Nūr*, 112, 9–114, 1.

⁹⁸ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 205, 2.

⁹⁹ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 10–13. Cf. Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 315, 1–4.

¹⁰⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 1.

rejects the view attributed to al-Xalīl, and argues that had there been an *'an muḍmara* after *'idan*, as in the case of the particles *li-* and *hattā*, it should have had an influence in contexts where in fact such influence is not attested. Thus, in the example *'Abdu llāhi 'idan ya'tika* one would have expected *naṣb*, since the same mood is attested in the synonymous example *'idan ya'tiyaka 'Abdu llāhi* (both examples mean 'therefore, 'Abdallāh will come to you'; in the first the verb is *marfū'* since the condition of *'idan* introducing the utterance is not fulfilled; see §6.1.1). Had there been a difference in meaning between these two examples, Sibawayhi explains, *raf'* in the first and *naṣb* in the second could have been explained, exactly as the different moods of the verbs following *hattā* are explained by the differences in meaning. Nevertheless, Sibawayhi concludes, such a difference does not exist in the examples with *'idan*.¹⁰¹

7.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not refer to this question in his *Ma'ānī*.

7.3. *Other grammarians*

Some grammarians quote the view attributed to al-Xalīl and discussed in §7.1 above, but like Sibawayhi, they also reject it.¹⁰² Al-Zajjāj, on the other hand, posits an *'an muḍmara* after *'idan*. He mentions the view attributed to al-Xalīl and Sibawayhi's opinion, states that both are good and suitable, and adds that in his opinion, whenever the verb takes *naṣb*, the *'amil* causing it is *'an*, whether *ẓāhira* 'appearing in the literal utterance' or *muqad-dara* 'existing in the speaker's mind in the *taqdīr* structure'.¹⁰³

8. THE INSTANCES OF *'IDAN* IN THE QUR'ĀN

In the Qur'ān there are three verses in which *'idan* occurs before an imperfect verb. In all three verses *'idan* follows a conjunction (twice *wa-* and once *fa-*), and the regular reading of the verb is with *raf'*. Despite the

¹⁰¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 1–5. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Ta'līqa* II, 135, 3–9.

¹⁰² See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 7, –1; 6, 12–7, 1; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, 5–6; al-Širbīnī, *Nūr*, 112, 5–6.

¹⁰³ See al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1973) II, 66, 14–67, 4. Cf. al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 236, 32–237, 5; 237, 12. Ibn al-Anbārī attributes to al-Xalīl the opinion mentioned above by al-Zajjāj, and adds that most grammarians reject it (he does not mention al-Zajjāj at all in this context). See Ibn al-Anbārī, *Asrār*, 129, 2 last lines.

verses' structural similarity, an exceptional reading of the verb with the *naṣb* mood is attested for only two of the verses. No grammarian raises the question of why this is so, considering the great similarity among all three verses.

The possibility of putting the verb in *naṣb* in the above-mentioned verses is described by some grammarians as *šādd* 'an exceptional instance from which no generalizations should be deduced'. Nevertheless, all grammarians justify both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* in these verses, according to the rule that the verb after *waʾidan*/*faʾidan* can be *marfūʿ* or *manṣūb* (see the views of Sibawayhi, al-Farrāʾ and other grammarians in §6.1.2.2, §6.2.4, and §6.4.3, respectively).¹⁰⁴

Here are the three verses (the other readings are in brackets):¹⁰⁵

- a. *ʾAm lahum naṣībun mina l-mulki faʾidan lā yuʾtūna (yuʾtū) l-nāsa naqīran* 'or a part [in the kingdom would be kept] for them (i.e. for the Jews)? Well (i.e. if it were so), they would not give men even the minimum (literally: the little hollow in the back of a date-stone)¹⁰⁶ (Qurʾān 4:53).¹⁰⁷
- b. *Waʾin kādū layastafizzūnaka mina l-ʾarḍi liyuxrijūka minhā waʾidan lā yalbatūna (yalbatū) xalfaka (xilāfaka) ʾillā qalīlan* 'and indeed they were near to making you flight from the land,¹⁰⁸ in order to expel you from it; but then (i.e. had it happened), they would not have stayed after you (i.e. after your departure) but for a short time only' (Qurʾān 17:76).¹⁰⁹
- c. *Qul lan yanfaʾakumu l-firāru ʾin qarrartum mina l-mawti ʾawi l-qatli waʾidan lā tumattaʾūna ʾillā qalīlan* 'say: flight will not profit you, if you decide [to flee], from [natural] death or from [death in] battle; but

¹⁰⁴ Interestingly, al-Suyūṭī in his *Itqān* indicates both options of *rafʿ* and *naṣb* in the above-mentioned two verses; he refers to the *naṣb* reading as *šādd*, but towards the end of his discussion of *ʾidan*, he justifies his claim that it consists of a noun ending with a tanwīn (i.e. *فِإٍ*; see §2) by the statement: *xuṣūṣan ʾannahā lam taqaʾ fīhi nāṣibatan* 'especially since it does not appear in it (i.e. in the Qurʾān) as an *ʾāmil* causing the verb to take *naṣb*'. See al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1857), 347, 16–18 and 349, 21–350, 1, respectively.

¹⁰⁵ The English translation of the verses is based on Fleischer's translation to German. See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 541.

¹⁰⁶ For this meaning, see Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2838c.

¹⁰⁷ Ibn Masʿūd is mentioned as reading the verb in *naṣb*. See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 273, 12–14 (Cf. Beck, *ʾIdan*, 433 (§c) and Kinberg, *al-Farrāʾ*, 120); Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʾumda*, 333, –1–334, 1; Howell, *Grammar* III, 660, 20–661, 3 (quoting al-Zamaxšarī's *al-Kaššāf ʾan ḥaqāʾiq al-tanzīl*).

¹⁰⁸ For this and one other meaning of *istafazza*, see Lane, *Lexicon* VI, 2392b.

¹⁰⁹ Al-Mubarrad and Ibn Yaʿīš attribute the reading with *naṣb* to Ibn Masʿūd, whereas Ibn Mālik indicates Ubayy b. Kaʿb as its source. See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 12, 3; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 926, 6; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʾumda*, 333, –1.

even then (i.e. even if it were so), you would not be allowed to enjoy but for a short time only' (Qur'ān 33:16).

In the Qur'ān *'idān* also occurs in sentences in which it is not followed by an imperfect verb and therefore has no syntactic influence. Fleischer examines these instances and sorts them according to the position of *'idān* in the sentence and its meaning.¹¹⁰ Few grammarians comment on any of these instances of *'idān*, probably because it does not and cannot have any syntactic influence in these contexts. Two exceptions to this are Qur'ān 26:19 quoted by al-Astarābādī and Qur'ān 23:93 quoted by al-Farrā' (see §5.3.2 and §6.3.2.2, respectively).

9. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE STATUS OF *'IDĀN* AS AN *'ĀMIL* AMONG SPEAKERS OF CERTAIN DIALECTS OF OLD ARABIC

As shown in the previous sections, there are many conditions which are needed so that *'idān* influence on the following verb to take *naṣb*. In addition, there are many disagreements among the grammarians concerning these conditions and the explanations for the sentence types in which it has an influence and for those in which it does not. It is therefore worth examining two hypotheses related to each other:

1. The influence of *'idān* on the following verb existed only in some Old Arabic dialects.
2. Among speakers of some Old Arabic dialects *'idān* developed from an adverb with no syntactic influence to an *'āmil* affecting the verb or vice versa, that is from *'āmil* to adverb. In other words, the development could have taken place in either direction: either *'idān* had originally no syntactic influence in the speech of some speakers but later became an *'āmil* in certain sentence types, or *'idān* was at first an *'āmil* in certain structures, and later, in some of the dialects, it lost its syntactic effect.

There is some evidence to support both hypotheses. As for the first, one should note Sibawayhi's remark that among some speakers of the language *'idān* had no syntactic influence on the following verb. A prominent feature

¹¹⁰ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 538–541. Cf. Trumpp, *Bedingungssatz*, 29, where some of these instances are referred to.

of his *Kitāb* is his tendency not to cover up opinions and examples which he opposes but rather to confront them. In chapter 237, devoted to 'īdan, this characteristic is also attested: after having explained the influence of 'īdan on the following verb and the conditions required for it, Sibawayhi notes that 'Īsā b. 'Umar said that some Bedouins said 'īdan 'af'alu dāka 'I will therefore do it' as a *jawāb* to a previous utterance, with the verb in *raf'*. In other words, even though the two primary conditions for the influence of 'īdan are fulfilled (i.e. it is part of a *jawāb* and introduces the utterance; see §6.1.1), this particle lacks the expected syntactic influence in their speech. Sibawayhi asks his teacher Yūnus for his opinion on the matter and the latter attempts to convince him to accept it: *lā tub'idanna dā walam yakun liyarwiya 'illā mā sami'a ja'alūhā bimanzilati hal wabal* 'do not consider it improbable; he (i.e. 'Īsā b. 'Umar) is not one who will report [linguistic information] except for the things which he heard (i.e. he reports only what he has heard from the Bedouins and should therefore be trusted). They (i.e. the Bedouins) used it (i.e. 'īdan) [as a particle] similar to *hal* and *bal* (i.e. particles which have no syntactic influence).¹¹¹ Whether or not the attempt to explain the lack of influence of 'īdan (the words *ja'alūhā bimanzilati hal wabal*) is a continuation of the words of Yūnus or Sibawayhi's explanation, we have here explicit evidence for the existence of dialectal differences in the usage of 'īdan. This evidence could also support the second hypothesis raised at the beginning of this section concerning the historical development of the use of 'īdan: in the speech of some speakers 'īdan was an 'āmīl in certain sentence types, whereas, at the same time, it was not an 'āmīl in the speech of others.

Ibn al-Sarrāj repeats 'Īsā b. 'Umar's statement without elaboration.¹¹² Al-Astarābādī, too, quotes Sibawayhi's words, as well as Yūnus' response, and adds that this statement of 'Īsā b. 'Umar is the reason for his (i.e. al-Astarābādī's) previously-mentioned opinion that putting the verb following 'īdan in *naṣb*, after the necessary conditions for the influence

¹¹¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 366, 18–20.

¹¹² See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1973) II, 154, 14–15. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *'Itqān* (1857), 349, 4–13, where the author quotes an opinion (from which he dissociates himself) according to which the verb after 'īdan can be put in *raf'* even where *naṣb* can be expected. Ibn Mālik's first sentence in his discussion of 'īdan in his *Tashīl* (see Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, 4) is worthy of note: *wayunṣabu ḡālīban bi'īdan muṣaddaratan 'in waliyahā* 'it (i.e. the verb) usually takes *naṣb* due to the influence of 'īdan when it introduces the utterance, if it follows it'. Ibn Mālik's use of the adverb *ḡālīban* 'usually', referring to the implementation of the syntactic influence of 'īdan, could be regarded as another proof that, at least in his opinion, its status as an 'āmīl is weaker than that of other particles which have a similar influence on the verb.

of *'iḍan* have been fulfilled, is *'afṣaḥ* 'more eloquent'.¹¹³ It can be thus inferred that al-Astarābādī believes that the syntactic influence of *'iḍan* is not compulsory and was not implemented by all Arabic speakers, even when all the conditions for such an influence were fulfilled. Furthermore, implementing this influence should be only regarded as more eloquent than its non-implementation.

As far as the second above-mentioned hypothesis is concerned, it is difficult to determine which historical development the use of *'iḍan* underwent: from an adverb with no syntactic influence to an *'āmil* or from an *'āmil* to such an adverb. The first possibility is supported by al-Xalīl's words in his *Kitāb al-'ayn*: as explained in §5.3.1, al-Xalīl defines and explains *'iḍan* without referring at all to the possibility that it could syntactically affect the following verb to take *naṣb*. Had the status of *'iḍan* as an *'āmil* causing *naṣb* been stable in the time of al-Xalīl (second century AH), one would expect that he would at least mention this characteristic, however briefly, as well as some examples from the speech of the Bedouins, the Qur'ān or ancient poetry. Sībawayhi indeed mentions that he was informed that al-Xalīl posited an *'an muḍmara* after *'iḍan*, but does not say who gave him this information and adds that he heard a different opinion from al-Xalīl himself (see §7.1). In addition, I have not been able to find any statement regarding *'an muḍmara* following *'iḍan* in al-Xalīl's dictionary. Both Sībawayhi's testimony that he did not hear this opinion attributed to al-Xalīl from al-Xalīl himself, and the fact that this opinion has no trace in *Kitāb al-'ayn*, cast doubt on whether this opinion is indeed due to al-Xalīl. Nevertheless, one should bear in mind that the evidence from *Kitāb al-'ayn* must be treated with some caution, because this book underwent many changes and the form in which it is available to us today differs from the original. If the data from *Kitāb al-'ayn* in its present form is deemed unreliable, one can indeed argue that the use of *'iḍan* developed in the opposite direction: from an *'āmil* to an adverb having no syntactic influence.

The analysis of the instances of *'iḍan* in the Qur'ān provides more evidence for the historical development hypothesis. As explained in §8, in the Qur'ān there are only three verses in which *'iḍan* appears before an imperfect verb, and in only two of the three is there a secondary reading of this verb with *naṣb*. Both the small number of instances in which *'iḍan* is followed by an imperfect verb (compared to the larger number of instances

¹¹³ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979) II, 238, 22–25.

of 'idan in other contexts) and the fact that its syntactic influence in these cases is considered secondary (compared to its non-influence, which is considered primary and regular), strengthen the assumption that in the language of the Qur'an the status of 'idan as an 'amil causing *naṣb* is not stable. In ancient Arabic poetry, too, the situation is similar.

10. CONCLUSION

'Idan and its influence on the following verb were the subject of many disagreements among grammarians and lexicographers, as well as among modern scholars. As seen in the previous sections, these disagreements concern almost every possible aspect related to 'idan: its spelling, its definition, the necessary conditions for its influence on the following verb, its etymology and the question if this particle itself, or rather 'an *muḍmara* following it, are responsible for its syntactic influence. Even where consensus exists with respect to the facts, as in the two possibilities of *rafʿ* and *naṣb* in the verb following *wa'idan/fa'idan*, different explanations and arguments are offered.

In the previous section I proposed the hypothesis that 'idan was originally used as an adverb meaning 'therefore' or 'well', with no syntactic effect. If this is true, its original spelling was إِذَا (and not اِذَنْ), the (adverbial) accusative form of اِذْ. According to this hypothesis, 'idan at some time began to be used as an 'amil in the speech of speakers of some Old Arabic dialects, to which perhaps, as Fleischer indicates, the apparent appearance of 'an in the last part of 'idan might have contributed:

Liegt aber auch in إِذَا, wo es den Conjunctiv regiert, ebenso wenig wie da, wo es den Indicativ nach sich hat, das Wort اِنَّ selbst, so doch unstreitig seine Bedeutung: die Bezeichnung eines zu erwartenden Erfolgs; wobei ich nicht bestreite, dass in der lebenden Sprache der Schein eines اِنَّ in dem Endlaute von idan dazu mitgewirkt haben kann 'but even if the word اِنَّ is found in إِذَا, where it causes the [following verb to take] naṣb (literally: subjunctive), as little as where rafʿ (literally: indicative) appears [in the verb] following it, its meaning is indisputable: an indication of an expected result; whereas I do not deny that in the living language the seeming appearance of اِنَّ in the last part of 'idan might have contributed to that'.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 542, 11–17.

ʿIdan was therefore considered by grammarians and lexicographers an *ʿamil* affecting the following verb, but the conditions required for its influence are so many and so complicated that they strengthen the hypothesis that its status remained “in between”: between a simple adverb with no syntactic effect to an *ʿamil*.

It seems to me that modern scholars who reject the potential syntactic influence of *ʿidān* out of hand are wrong. An extreme example of this are Gaudefroy-Demombynes and Blachère, who confidently declare that the grammarians adopted the etymological explanation of *ʿid+ʿan*, and thus invented the examples in which a verb in *naṣb* follows *ʿidān* (see §4.4.4). They subsequently refer the reader to Fleischer’s words, which allegedly support their view, although a careful reading shows that his opinion is different: he indeed limits the syntactic effect of *ʿidān* (just as the grammarians do), but he does not claim that the grammarians invented the examples in which this effect is attested:

Jedenfalls aber war diese Rectionskraft bei den sie anerkennenden Arabern durch die für ihre Wirksamkeit geltenden Bedingungen auf einen engen Kreis beschränkt, und selbst innerhalb desselben wurde ihre Anwendung durch die von den Grammatikern aufgezählten Nebenumstände theils ganz aufgehoben, theils in das Belieben des Sprechenden gestellt ‘but in any case this [syntactic] influence was limited among the Arabs who admitted it to a limited domain [of uses and structures] by the conditions for its effect, and even among those its function was partly canceled by the attendant circumstances enumerated by the grammarians and partly put to the wish (i.e. preference) of the speaker’.¹¹⁵

Finally, I would like to mention three previously-mentioned sources which would seem to support the view proposed in this section:

- a. Al-Suyūṭī’s quote (mentioned also in al-Bustānī’s *Muḥīṭ*) of an anonymous claim that the uses of the particle *ʿidān* can be divided into two kinds: in the first it has a syntactic effect on the following verb and in the second it has no such effect (for the full quote, see §5.3.3-b). In view of the examples in which *ʿidān* is used, both those provided by the grammarians and those found in the Qurʾān and in poetry, this division seems appropriate.
- b. De Sacy’s view that in addition to the simple adverb *ʿidān*, which has no syntactic effect on the mood of the following verb, there also exists a second adverb *ʿidān* which is a compound of *ʿid* and *ʿan*, and that it

¹¹⁵ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 542, 17–22.

is this second adverb that induces the following verb to take *našb* (for details, see §4.4.1). Like Fleischer, I also disagree with de Sacy's attempt to divide the different usages of 'iḏan in this way. I believe that the linguistic reality in which this word is sometimes used as an 'āmil and sometimes as an adverb with no syntactic effect, caused de Sacy to try to arrive at a rational explanation of these two possibilities. Even if his etymological explanation seems to be wrong, 'iḏan does seem to fulfill two different roles: that of 'āmil and of adverb.

CHAPTER FIVE

'AW

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to 'aw, one of the conjunctions following which the verb can take *našb*. All grammarians emphasize that in most sentence types in which 'aw is followed by a verb in *našb*, it denotes a meaning other than 'or', its regular meaning as a conjunction. However, in the sentence type in which a noun and an imperfect verb are connected by 'aw and the verb is *manšūb*, 'aw is taken as having its regular meaning 'or', and the *našb* mood of the verb is explained as due to 'atf between two elements which are not of the same kind, viz. a noun and a verb. This principle applies not only to 'aw, but to the other conjunctions, too; for details on this 'atf see appendix A, §2.

1.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi devotes a whole chapter in his *Kitāb* to 'aw followed by *našb* (chapter 243; Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 8–382, 12). There he treats the sentence types in which 'aw may be followed by *našb* and provides examples from the speech of the Bedouins, the Qur'ān and ancient poetry.

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' discusses 'aw followed by *našb* in his commentary on four Qur'ānic verses: Qur'ān 3:128, 14:13, 42:51 and 48:16. His views on these verses are discussed in the relevant sections of this chapter.

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Most other grammarians do not discuss 'aw followed by a *manšūb* verb at any length. Some do not even mention it in their presentation of the *našb* mood.¹

¹ See, for example, Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, 147–148. In his *ʿĪdāh*, al-Fārisī does not mention 'aw among the words following which *našb* may occur, but in his later, more detailed discussion of the *našb* mood, he treats 'aw in a specific chapter; see al-Fārisī, *ʿĪdāh* I, 167 and

2. SENTENCE TYPES IN WHICH 'AW CAN BE FOLLOWED BY A *MANŠŪB* VERB, AND THE POSSIBILITY OF PUTTING THIS VERB IN *RAF'*

2.1. *Sibawayhi*

Chapter 243 treats three sentence types in which 'aw is followed by *našb* (see §§2.1.1–2.1.3 for these sentence types, *Sibawayhi*'s examples and the possibility of *raf'*). In the first two sentence types the meaning of 'aw is 'illā 'an 'unless', whereas in the third one it retains its original meaning as a conjunction ('or'), the following *našb* resulting from joining a nominal element to a verb.

2.1.1. *An imperfect verb* (yaf'alu or layaf'alanna) + 'aw + yaf'ala; 'aw meaning 'illā 'an

This is the primary sentence type, which *Sibawayhi* discusses at length.² He gives the following four examples of this sentence type in which the verb following 'aw is *manšūb*:

- a. *La'alzamannaka 'aw tu'ṭiyanī* 'I will be attached to you unless you give me [something]'.³
- b. *La'alzamannaka 'aw taqḍiyanī* 'I will be attached to you unless you supply me [with a certain need]'.⁵
- c. *La'aḍribannaka 'aw tasbiqanī* 'I will hit you unless you precede me'.⁵
- d. A line of poetry: *faqultu lahu lā tabki 'aynuka 'innamā / nuḥāwilu mulkan 'aw namūta fanu'darā* 'I told him: let your eye not cry! We seek to reign unless we die and are thus forgiven'.⁶

II, 1077–1079, respectively. For a short reference by one of the commentators on al-Fārisī's *ʿIqdāh*, see Ibn Abī Rabi', *Kāfi* II, 243, 2 last lines. See also Ibn Sīda, *Muxaššaṣ* XIV, 54, 4 last lines, where the lexicon's author, like al-Fārisī, does not mention the possibility of *našb* following 'aw in his discussion of the *našb* mood.

² For the whole discussion, see *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 380, 8–381, 1.

³ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 380, 10.

⁴ Jahn and Wright add *ḥaqqī* 'my need/right' as a direct object of *taqḍiyanī*; see Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 90, note 3 of chapter 243; Wright, *Grammar* II, 33, 11–12. Cf. al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 437, 10–11, where the author adds the specific direct object *daynī* 'my debt', although in my opinion it would have been more appropriate to add a more general direct object, such as *al-ḥaqq* (compare the similar addition of a general direct object in the previous example).

⁵ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 380, 12.

⁶ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Imru' al-Qays. For *Sibawayhi*'s discussion of this verse, see *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 380, 13–18. For its context and some explanations of its words, see al-Sīrāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 59–60 (verse 372); al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 396 (verse 612) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 427.

Sībawayhi subsequently quotes a Qur'ānic verse and another line of poetry in which 'aw is followed by a *marfū'* verb.⁷ The Qur'ānic verse is *satud'awna 'ilā qawmin 'ulī ba'sin šadīdin tuqātilūnahum 'aw yuslimūna* 'you shall be called against a people of great power to fight them or they will surrender' (Qur'ān 48:16); the line of poetry will not be quoted here.

Sībawayhi says that in this sentence type, the verb following 'aw may take the *raf'* mood (as in the last two examples mentioned above), which can be explained in two ways, either as 'iṣrāk, i.e. the imperfect verbs preceding and following 'aw are both affected by the same 'āmīl and occupy the same syntactic position, or as *inqiṭā'*, i.e. the imperfect verb following 'aw introduces a new sentence and is therefore *marfū'* (for detailed explanations of 'iṣrāk and *inqiṭā'*, see appendix A, §5 and §4, respectively). For example, the verb following 'aw in the above-quoted line of poetry (see d. above) can be *marfū'* due to *inqiṭā'*, if the intended *taqdīr* structure is [*nuḥāwilu mulkan*] 'aw *naḥnu mimman yamūtu* '[we seek to reign] or we are from those who die'.⁸

2.1.2. *A non-imperfect verb (imperative, perfect or participle) + 'aw + yaf'ala; 'aw meaning 'illā 'an*

This sentence type differs from the previous one in that what precedes 'aw is not an imperfect verb.⁹ Here, too, 'aw means 'illā 'an and can be followed by a *manṣūb* verb. Sībawayhi provides the following examples:

- a. 'Aw following an imperative verb: *ilzamhu 'aw yattaqiyaka biḥaqqika* 'be attached to him unless he guards himself from preventing you from your right!';¹⁰ *iḍribhu 'aw yastaqīma* 'hit him unless he is straight (or: behaves properly)!'.¹¹
- b. 'Aw following a perfect verb: *wakuntu 'idā ġamaztu qanāta qawmin / kasartu ku'ūbahā 'aw tastaqīmā* 'when I checked the strength of the bayonet of a [certain] tribe (literally: touched it with the hands), I untied its knots unless it was straight'.¹²

⁷ For Sībawayhi's discussion of these two examples, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 18–20 and 380, 20–381, 1, respectively.

⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 17–18. Cf. Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 931, 18–19; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 23, 14–24, 8.

⁹ For the discussion of this sentence type, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 381, 1–14.

¹⁰ For a translation of this example, see Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 162, 13–14. For the meaning of the verb *ittaqa*, see Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 3059a; Hava, *Dictionary*, 889a.

¹¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 381, 1–2.

¹² A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by Ziyād al-A'jam. For Sībawayhi's discussion of this verse, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 381, 2–4. According to Abū Muḥammad al-Sirāfī, the poet's intended

- c. 'Aw following an active participle: *huwa qātīlī 'aw 'aftadiya minhu* 'he will kill me unless I pay him a ransom'.¹³

In this sentence type, too, the verb following 'aw may take *raf'*, but here this mood can be explained in one way only, as due to *inqiṭā'*. Unlike the previous case, *'iṣrāk* is not a possible explanation here, because the elements preceding and following 'aw are not of the same kind: the former is not an imperfect verb, and the latter is.¹⁴ In order to exemplify the possibility of *raf'*, Sibawayhi says that in the last above-mentioned example (see c. above), the verb following 'aw may take *raf'*, if it is conceived as introducing a new sentence, with the *taqdīr* structure 'aw 'anā 'aftadī. In that case, the sentence would be *huwa qātīlī 'aw 'aftadī minhu*, meaning 'he will kill me or I will pay him a ransom'.

2.1.3. 'Aw meaning 'or' which joins a nominal element to an imperfect verb
This sentence type differs from the preceding two, because 'aw here is a regular conjunction which preserves its meaning of 'or'. It connects a nominal element and an imperfect verb, and since these are not of the same kind, this imperfect verb is *manṣūb*. For an explanation of this 'atf 'adjunction', according to Sibawayhi, as well as his two examples of this sentence type, see appendix A, §2.1.

2.2. Al-Farrā'

As mentioned in §1.2, al-Farrā's views on 'aw followed by a *manṣūb* verb can be inferred from his commentaries on four Qur'ānic verses. In his discussion of Qur'ān 3:128 and 48:16 al-Farrā' focuses mainly on the meaning of 'aw in this structure (see §3.2 below). His commentary on Qur'ān 14:13 reveals a similar approach to Sibawayhi's concerning the first sentence type which the latter discusses (see §2.1.1).¹⁵ The verse is *waqāla*

meaning was that when he mocked a certain group, he deeply hurt it, unless it ceased mocking him. Al-Šantamarī, on the other hand, explains that the poet's intention was that when some people proved troublesome to him, he tried to mollify them until they behaved properly. See al-Sirāfī, *'Abyāt* II, 170 2–3 (verse 441); al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 397 (verse 614) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 428; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 723, 1–2. For al-Šantamarī's view, see also Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 91, note 6 of chapter 243; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) V, 389b, 1–5 (quoted and explained in Lane, *Lexicon* I, 122c, 51–54; VI, 2293c).

For other interpretations of this verse, see al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ ṣawāhid* (1904), 74; al-Baġdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 446.

¹³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 381, 5.

¹⁴ For this explanation, see Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 162, 19–20.

¹⁵ For the whole discussion, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 70, 6–71, 11.

llaḏīna kaḡarū lirusulihim lanuxrijannakum min 'arḑinā 'aw lata'ūḏunna fī millatinā 'the unbelievers said to their messengers: we will surely expel you from our land, or you will surely return to our religion.' In this verse, says al-Farrā', the verbs preceding and following 'aw share the same syntactic slot, of *jawāb al-yamīn* 'the utterance following an oath', and are therefore introduced by *lām* (*lām al-ta'kīd* 'the particle *la-* of emphasis'). Al-Farrā' says that an alternative, possible and similar structure would be with a *manṣūb* verb following 'aw, as in *wallāhi la'aḡribannaka 'aw tuḡirra lī* 'by God, I will surely hit you unless (or: in order that) you recognize for me [my right]'. He explains that in this sentence 'aw means 'illā or ḡattā (thus the above-mentioned two possible translations of his example). Since al-Farrā' provides more examples of this structure in which the verb preceding 'aw is of the form *yaf'alu* (two lines of poetry and another Qur'ānic verse—Qur'ān 48:16 mentioned above), it can be inferred that this sentence type, in his view, is not limited to the form *layaf'alanna* preceding 'aw, but includes the form *yaf'alu* as well. This corresponds exactly to Sībawayhi's description of this sentence type.

Al-Farrā' also discusses examples of 'aw followed by a *manṣūb* verb and preceded by a non-imperfect verb, a use that corresponds to Sībawayhi's second sentence type (see §2.1.2). This is the type exemplified by Qur'ān 3:128, which al-Farrā' quotes, and the sentence *lastu li'abī 'in lam 'aqtulka 'aw tasbiḡanī* 'I am not [the son] of my father, if I do not kill you, unless you precede me', in which the verb preceding 'aw is in the perfect form.¹⁶

As for Sībawayhi's third sentence type (see §2.1.3), it can be inferred from al-Farrā' commentary on Qur'ān 42:51 that for him, too, an 'aw that connects a noun and a verb is a regular conjunction meaning 'or', so that the following verb is *manṣūb*.¹⁷ This verse is quoted, translated and discussed in appendix A, §2.1-a; cf. appendix A, §2.2.

2.3. Other grammarians

Most grammarians adopt Sībawayhi's explanation of *naṣb* following 'aw, but some also add other points of view. The following is a concise description of some salient grammarians' views on this subject.

In his discussion of the mood of the verb following 'aw, al-Mubarrad states that *raf'* is always possible, but *naṣb* can only appear in some contexts. He states that 'aw when followed by a *manṣūb* verb means ḡattā or

¹⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 71, 5–11.

¹⁷ For his discussion, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 422, 8–12.

'illā 'an (see §3.3.3), and so whenever 'aw can be replaced by one of these two particles, the following verb may take *naṣb*. When, on the other hand, it is clear that the meanings of *ḥattā* and 'illā 'an do not fit the sentence, the *naṣb* mood is not possible, but only *rafʿ*, as in 'atajlisu 'aw taqūmu yā fatā 'do you sit or stand, boy?'; *hal tukallimunā 'aw tanbasītu 'ilaynā* 'do you converse with us or act towards us with arrogance?';¹⁸ and the Qur'ānic verse¹⁹ 'aw yanfa'ūnakum 'aw yaḍurrūna 'or do they profit you or harm?' (Qur'ān 26:73).²⁰

Ibn Yaʿīš, too, refers to the difference between 'aw as a regular conjunction meaning 'or' and as a particle meaning 'illā 'an, but from a different point of view. In the former use the verbs preceding and following 'aw are equivalent in status and value, and their order can be interchanged without changing the meaning of the sentence. In the latter use, on the other hand, interchanging the two verbs will result in a totally different meaning. As an example, Ibn Yaʿīš considers the following two sentences, which differ only in the mood of the verb following 'aw: *satukallimu Zaydan 'aw yaqḍī ḥājataka* 'you will converse with Zayd or he will supply [you] with your need' and *satukallimu Zaydan 'aw yaqḍiya ḥājataka* 'you will converse with Zayd unless he supplies [you] with your need'. In the first sentence 'aw is a regular conjunction which joins two verbs in *rafʿ*, and so the order of these verbs may be changed without changing the meaning of the sentence: *sayaqḍī ḥājataka Zaydun 'aw tukallimuhu* 'Zayd will supply [you] with your need or you will converse with him'. A similar change of order in the second sentence, in which 'aw means 'illā 'an and is followed by *naṣb*, will result in a different meaning: *sayaqḍī ḥājataka Zaydun 'aw tukallimahu* 'Zayd will supply [you] with your need unless you converse with him'.²¹

Ibn Mālik's discussion of the mood of the verb following 'aw also reflects an attempt to associate mood change and meaning. He argues that putting the verbs preceding and following 'aw in *rafʿ* reflects the speaker's doubt with respect to the occurrence of the actions denoted by both verbs. Putting the verb following 'aw in *naṣb*, on the other hand,

¹⁸ For this meaning of *inbaṣaṭa 'ilā*, see Lane, *Lexicon* I, 204a, 7–14.

¹⁹ This verse continues a question that begins in the preceding one: *qāla hal yasma'ūnakum 'id tad'ūna* 'he said: do they hear you when you call?' (Qur'ān 26:72).

²⁰ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 29, 4–8. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 156, 2–7.

²¹ See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 930, 24–931, 7. A similar explanation provides Brockelmann, who emphasizes that when 'aw means 'illā 'an, it introduces an utterance subordinate to the preceding one, and this relationship of subordination is then expressed by the *naṣb* mood. See Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 492–493 (§307.a).

reflects the speaker's doubt concerning the occurrence of the action of this verb alone, whereas the occurrence of the action of the verb preceding 'aw is not in doubt. In other words, the moods of the two verbs differ because of a difference of meaning.²²

3. THE MEANING OF 'AW FOLLOWED BY A MANŞŪB VERB

3.1. *Sibawayhi*

At the beginning of chapter 243 in his Kitāb, in which 'aw is discussed, Sibawayhi says *wa'lam 'anna ma'nā mā ntaṣaba ba'da 'aw 'alā 'illā 'an* 'know that the meaning of what is *manşūb* (i.e. the *manşūb* verb) following 'aw is 'illā 'an 'unless'.²³ Thus the sentence *la'alzamannaka 'aw taqḍiyanī* (quoted and explained in §2.1.1-b above) means *la'alzamannaka 'illā 'an taqḍiyanī*. As Jahn rightfully remarks, this is a meaning which differs from the regular meaning of the conjunction 'aw 'or', when it connects two elements of the same kind.²⁴ It is important to distinguish between two types of utterances which Sibawayhi uses to explain 'aw followed by *naṣb* (as well as other particles followed by the *naṣb* mood): one reflects the *ma'nā* 'meaning' of the literal utterance, while the other reflects the *tamṭīl* (i.e. *taqdīr*) structure, which accounts for the grammatical structure of the literal utterance. In the case of the above-mentioned sentence *la'alzamannaka 'aw taqḍiyanī*, the former is *la'alzamannaka 'illā 'an taqḍiyanī*, whereas the latter is *layakūnanna l-luzūmu 'aw 'an taqḍiyanī* 'there will surely be an attachment [between you and me] or your supplying me (literally: that you supply me) [with a certain need]'.²⁵ For the *taqdīr* structure according to Sibawayhi, see §4.1.

It should be noted that in most examples in this chapter the meaning of 'aw followed by a *manşūb* verb is indeed 'illā 'an, but in the examples of Sibawayhi's third sentence type, in which 'aw connects a noun and an imperfect verb, its meaning is 'or'. For this sentence type, see §2.1.3 above.

²² See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 25, 5–17. Cf. Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 480, 5–19.

²³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 11.

²⁴ See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 161, 18–19.

²⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 11–13. For a clear explanation of the fundamental difference between an utterance that reflects the *ma'nā* and one that reflects the *taqdīr*, see al-Fārisī, *Ta'līq* II, 164, 1–8. Cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 53, 5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 121, 3–7. See also Ayoub, *Tamṭīl*, 6–7.

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

In his commentary on Qur'ān 3:128, in which two *manṣūb* verbs follow two occurrences of 'aw, al-Farrā' compares the occurrence of the *naṣb* mood after 'aw with that following *ḥattā*;²⁶ *wa'in šī'ta ja'alta naṣbahu 'alā maḍhabi ḥattā* 'and if you wish, you can consider the *naṣb* mood [of the verb following 'aw] in accordance with *ḥattā* [followed by *naṣb*']'. According to al-Farrā's subsequent example, *lā 'azālu mulāzimaka 'aw tu'ṭiyānī 'aw 'illā 'an tu'ṭiyānī ḥaqqī* 'I will not cease to be attached to you unless you give me my right', it can be inferred that he understands 'aw to mean 'illā 'an. However, in his commentaries on Qur'ān 14:13 and 48:16,²⁷ he says that the meaning of 'aw is either *ḥattā* or 'illā 'an. This is consistent with the statement by the early lexicographer al-Azharī, that according to al-Farrā' both meanings are possible when 'aw is followed by a *manṣūb* verb.²⁸

3.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that the meaning of 'aw followed by *naṣb* is 'illā 'an; al-Xalīl and some other grammarians and lexicographers say that 'aw means *ḥattā*; others claim, like al-Farrā', that both 'illā 'an and *ḥattā* are possible meanings of 'aw. In the context of the *naṣb* mood, *ḥattā* can actually have two meanings: 'ilā 'an or *kay* (see chapter 8, §3.3.1), but most grammarians who attribute the meaning of *ḥattā* to 'aw, have only the meaning of 'ilā 'an in mind, and not of *kay*.

3.3.1. *The meaning 'illā 'an 'unless'*

Many grammarians agree with Sibawayhi, that the meaning of 'aw followed by *naṣb* is 'illā 'an.²⁹ Al-Zajjāj and Ibn al-Sarrāj say so at the beginning of their discussion of *naṣb* following 'aw, but in their explanations of the relevant examples, they say that 'aw may have the meaning of 'illā

²⁶ For the whole discussion, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 234, 1–5.

²⁷ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 70, 6–11 and III, 66, –3––2, respectively.

²⁸ See al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 659a, 1–9.

²⁹ See, for example, Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 53, 1–2; Ibn Fāris, *Šāhibī*, 127, –1–128, 1; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 315, 2; Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, *Iḥṣāḥ*, 99, 11; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 221, 3–6; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 930, 10; 931, 12–16; 940, 8–12 (there Ibn Ya'īš justifies Sibawayhi's opinion and criticizes that of al-Zamaxšarī, according to which the meaning is equivalent to 'ilā 'an; see note 32 for a reference of the latter); Ibn Abī Rabī', *Kāfī* II, 243, –1–244, 2; al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 133, 9–134, 6; Abū Ḥayyān, *Taqrīb*, 81, 13.

ʿan or *ḥattā* (corresponding to the opinion presented in §3.3.3 below; for references see note 34 there).

Al-Šantamarī, who also maintains that ʿaw followed by *naṣb* means ʿillā ʿan, says that the conjunction ʿaw and the particle ʿillā share a semantic feature which makes it possible for the former to take on the meaning of the latter in this context. The shared feature is that both denote a divergence from the preceding element. Al-Šantamarī explains that what precedes ʿillā is a universal statement, and what follows it is an exception to or a negation of this statement, as in *jāʿa l-qawmu ʿillā Zaydan* ‘all people came except for Zayd’, in which what precedes ʿillā denotes the arrival of all people, including Zayd, and what follows ʿillā controverts Zayd’s arrival. Similarly, in *jāʿanī Zaydun ʿaw ʿAmrun* ‘Zayd or ʿAmr came to me’, the utterance preceding ʿaw denotes the arrival of Zayd, but once ʿaw is added to the sentence, his arrival is no longer certain.³⁰

3.3.2. The meaning ḥattā: ʿilā ʿan ‘until’ or kay ‘in order that’

Al-Xalīl says that ʿaw followed by a *manṣūb* verb has a meaning like that of *ḥattā*. From his short statement it is unclear whether he means *ḥattā* in the sense of ʿilā ʿan or kay, but the former seems more reasonable in light of his example: *faqltu lahu lā tabki ʿaynaka ʿinnamā / nuḥāwilu mulkan ʿaw namūta fanuʿdarā* ‘I told him: let your eye not cry! We seek to reign until we die and are thus forgiven’ (this verse is also quoted by Sībawayhi, who takes ʿaw here to mean ʿillā ʿan; see §2.1.1-d).³¹ Most grammarians and lexicographers who, like al-Xalīl, contend that ʿaw followed by *naṣb* means *ḥattā*, explicitly say that the intended meaning is equivalent to ʿilā ʿan and not to kay.³² However, Ibn Yaʿīš attributes to al-Kisāʿī the opinion that ʿaw may mean either ʿilā ʿan or kay, as in *satudʿawna ʿilā qawmin ʿulī baʿsin šadīdin tuqātilūnahum ʿaw yuslimū* ‘you shall be called against a people of great power to fight them until/so that they surrender’ (Qurʾān

³⁰ See al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 720, 9–721, 7. Cf. al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 437, 11–17; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 931, 7–12, where the two authors seem to copy al-Šantamarī’s words without mentioning his name.

³¹ See al-Xalīl, *Ayn* VIII, 438, 15–18; 439, 1. In fact, in this line of poetry the meaning ʿilā ʿan is more plausible than kay, since, as Ibn ʿUṣfūr says, *lā yaṭlubu l-mulka kay yamūta* ‘he does not seek to reign in order to die’. See Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 156, 10–13. Cf. Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 166, 13–15; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *ʿAmālī* II, 313, 2–4; al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ*, 504–505 (verse 253).

³² See, for example, al-Fārisī, *ʿIdāḥ* II, 1077, 9–10; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 444, 4–5; al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 9–10; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 154, 5–7; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 1; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 366, 18–21; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 166, 7–15; al-Šanʿānī, *Tahḏīb*, 74, 2–3; 249, –1–250, 1; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Šarḥ*, 479, 7–9.

48:16, quoted by Sibawayhi, too, but with the reading in which the verb following 'aw is in *raf'*; see §2.1.1).³³

3.3.3. *The meanings ḥattā and 'illā 'an*

Some grammarians and lexicographers argue that 'aw followed by *naṣb* may mean *ḥattā* or *'illā 'an*. By *ḥattā*, the meaning *'ilā 'an* is usually intended, and not *kay* (cf. the end of §3.3.2 above).³⁴ Some claim that the meaning *'ilā 'an* fits sentences in which the action denoted by the verb preceding 'aw takes place gradually (*yanqaḍī ṣay'an faṣay'an* '[the action] occurs little by little'), whereas in other sentences, in which the action occurs all at once, 'aw means *'illā 'an*.³⁵ It is worth noting that some grammarians also characterize the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* as occurring gradually, when this preposition is followed by *naṣb* (see chapter 8, §11.3).

Some grammarians who hold the view that 'aw may mean *ḥattā* or *'illā 'an* state that a sentence's context and semantics sometimes permit only one of these meanings and sometimes allow them both. Ibn Burhān al-Ukbarī gives some examples, among them the sentence *'ayyuhā l-muslimu ṣalli ba'da rtiḥā'i l-šamsi 'aw taqūma l-šamsu* 'O Muslim, pray following the sunset until it rises!', in which 'aw cannot mean *'illā 'an*, but only *ḥattā* (viz. *'ilā 'an*).³⁶

Al-Astarābādī notes that although Sibawayhi says that 'aw means *'illā 'an* whereas others argue for the meaning *'ilā*, in fact these two meanings are actually derived from one.³⁷ Ibn Mālik, who refers to these two meanings, says that whenever 'aw may mean *'ilā 'an*, it may also mean *'illā 'an*, but the converse is not true: not in every context in which 'aw means

³³ See Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 940, 16–18. Cf. Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 156, 8–9.

³⁴ See al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1994) I, 468, 4–6; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 28, 5; 28, 8–10; III, 306, 3–5; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 155, 4–2; al-Zajjājī, *Hurūf*, 51, 6–52, 1; al-Šāḥib Ibn 'Abbād, *al-Muḥīṭ* X, 470, 13–15; al-Harawī, *Azhiyā*, 121, 8–122, last line; Ibn Sida, *Muḥkam* X, 599, 2–3; al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 81, 2; al-Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 32, 4–5; Ibn Mu'ī, *Fuṣūl*, 206, 8–9; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 166, 16–17; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 106, 5; 120, 8–10; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, 1–231, 1; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 335, 4–6; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 479, 7–9; Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān* (1956) XIV, 55a, 12ff.; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 318, 6–7; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 59, 11–12; 60, 6–7; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 80, 1.

³⁵ See, for example, Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 295, 1–3. Cf. Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 536, 12–19; Wright, *Grammar* II, 33, 18–20; Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 326.

³⁶ See Ibn Burhān al-Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 363, 5–9. Cf. Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Iršād* II, 360, 18–363, 1.

³⁷ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 77, 10–13. Independently of al-Astarābādī, the modern scholar Fleischer holds the same view. See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 536, 12–22.

ʾillā ʾan, can it also mean *ʾilā ʾan*. Therefore, adds Ibn Mālik, Sibawayhi was right to mention only the meaning *ʾillā ʾan*.³⁸ Elsewhere Ibn Mālik argues that there is an *ʾijmāʿ* ‘consensus’ that *ʾaw* means *ʾillā ʾan*, whereas the meaning of *ḥattā* derives from the Kūfans. Nevertheless, he says, this meaning is correct according to the speech of the Bedouins.³⁹

4. WHAT INDUCES THE VERB FOLLOWING ʾAW TO BE *MANṢŪB*?

The grammarians disagree as to what induces *naṣb* in a verb that follows *ʾaw* (as well as the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*, discussed in the following chapters, 6–7). Sibawayhi’s view, with which most grammarians agree, is that the *naṣb* mood is due to an *ʾan muḍmara* (see §4.1 and §4.3.1); al-Farrāʾ explains this mood by the principle of *xilāf*, an explanation attributed to the Kūfans in general (see §4.2 and §4.3.2); and the Baṣran grammarian al-Jarmī holds the view, which some attribute to al-Kisāʾī as well, that the conjunction itself induces *naṣb* in the following verb (see §4.3.3).⁴⁰

4.1. Sibawayhi

Sibawayhi argues that the mood of the verb following *ʾaw* is due to the influence of an *ʾan muḍmara*. The first sentence of chapter 243 in his *Kitāb*, devoted to *ʾaw*, is *iʿlam ʾanna mā ntaṣaba baʿda ʾaw faʾinnahu yantaṣibu ʾalā ʾiḍmāri ʾan* ‘know that what is *manṣūb* (i.e. the *manṣūb* verb) following *ʾaw* is put in *naṣb* due to a concealed *ʾan* in the speaker’s mind’. Sibawayhi subsequently compares *naṣb* following *ʾaw* with *naṣb* following the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*, and mentions several similarities. First, the *manṣūb* verb following all three conjunctions is in *naṣb* due to an *ʾan muḍmara*, which is not pronounced in the literal utterance. Secondly, the *taqdīr* structure of sentences with each of these three conjunctions is similar, with a noun attached to an element equivalent to a noun. For example, the *taqdīr* structure of *laʾalzamannaka ʾaw tuʿṭiyānī* is *layakūnanna l-luzūmu ʾaw ʾan tuʿṭiyānī* ‘there will surely be an attachment [between

³⁸ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 25, 18–19.

³⁹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʾumda*, 336, 7–8.

⁴⁰ For a short presentation of these three views, see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1680, 15–16; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid* III, 81, 8–10; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 202, 8–203, 2; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 117, 7–11.

you and me] or your giving me [something]’.⁴¹ As for the meaning of *’aw* in this context, Sībawayhi notes that it is *’illā ’an*, a meaning which differs from that of the *taqdīr* structure where *’aw ’an*, not *’illā ’an*, is found. This is the third point of resemblance between *’aw* and the two conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*, when they are followed by a *manṣūb* verb: their meanings are not derived from the *taqdīr* structures.⁴²

4.2. *Al-Farrā’*

According to al-Farrā’ the *naṣb* mood following *’aw*, as well as other conjunctions, is due to *xilāf*. The essence of this principle, which is explained at length in appendix A, §16, is that due to the difference of meaning between the verbs preceding and following the conjunction, the latter is *manṣūb*. Al-Farrā’ is quoted as saying that the meaning *’ilā* or *’illā* is added to a *manṣūb* verb that follows *’aw*, and therefore the utterance that follows *’aw* differs from the one that precedes it.⁴³ In al-Farrā’'s commentary on several Qur’ānic verses he argues that the meaning of *’aw* is *ḥattā* or *’illā ’an* (for details and references, see §3.2). These meanings reflect an implementation of his *xilāf* principle: the verb that follows *’aw* differs semantically and thus syntactically from the one that precedes it.

4.3. *Other grammarians*

4.3.1. *The verb following ’aw is manṣūb due to ’an muḍmara*

Most grammarians agree with Sībawayhi that *’an muḍmara* accounts for the *naṣb* mood of the verb following *’aw*, so that the *taqdīr* structure contains two attached verbal nouns.⁴⁴ Some justify this view using the principle of *al-’āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ*: since *’aw* is a conjunction, and can connect both nouns and verbs, it can have no syntactic effect on either, and the

⁴¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 8–10, where the author uses *ka’annahū yaqūlu* ‘as if he says’ to indicate what is later known as the *taqdīr* structure.

⁴² See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 11–16.

⁴³ Al-Farrā’ is quoted in al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 54, –1–55, 3.

⁴⁴ See, for example, al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 7, 1; 28, 5; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 91, 11–12; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 197, 6; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 151 (*mas’ala* 161); al-Rummānī, *Ma’ānī*, 79, –3; Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā’iṣ* (1990) I, 264, –1–265, 1; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1078, 3; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 5; al-’Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 32, 5–6; Ibn Mu’ī, *Fuṣūl*, 203, 7–8; 203, 12–13; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, –1; al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 134, 7–12.

naṣb mood must therefore be due to an *’an muḍmara* (a similar explanation is given with regards to the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*).⁴⁵

As for *’an* following *’aw* in the literal utterance, the grammarians hold Sībawayhi’s view that this is impermissible when *’aw* means *’illā*. They justify this using several theoretical arguments.⁴⁶

4.3.2. *The verb following ’aw is manṣūb due to xilāf*

The view that the verb following *’aw* is *manṣūb* due to *xilāf* is attributed to al-Farrā’ in particular and to the Kūfans in general.⁴⁷

4.3.3. *The verb following ’aw is manṣūb due to the influence of ’aw itself*

According to some grammarians the Baṣrans attribute the *naṣb* following *’aw* to an *’an muḍmara*, but the Baṣran grammarian al-Jarmī argues that *’aw* itself induces the *naṣb* mood (this is also his view on *fa-* and *wa-* followed by *naṣb*).⁴⁸ Some attribute this opinion to al-Kisā’ī as well.⁴⁹

5. THE SEPARATION BETWEEN ’AW AND THE FOLLOWING VERB

5.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi does not refer to this issue in his *Kitāb*.

5.2. *Al-Farrā’*

Al-Farrā’, like Sībawayhi, does not explicitly refer to this issue.

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians do not refer at all to the possibility of separating *’aw* and the following verb. Those who treat this issue are al-Astarābādī, Ibn Mālik, Abū Ḥayyān and al-Suyūṭī.

⁴⁵ See al-Warrāq, *’Ilal*, 76, 4–7; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 153, 17–154, 15; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 207, 13–208, 2; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 367, 5–10; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 53, 11–15; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 26, 6–7; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 201, 3–202, 2.

⁴⁶ See, for example, al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 437, 17–438, 3; Ibn Ya’īs, *Šarḥ* II, 930, 21–24; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 26, 14–17.

⁴⁷ See, for example, Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 141, 2–5.

⁴⁸ See al-Baṭalyawsī, *’Iṣlāḥ*, 49, 2–4; 245, –3–2; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 367, 10–12; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 54, 13.

⁴⁹ See, for example, Ibn ‘Aqil, *Musā’id* III, 81, 10.

As mentioned in chapter 8, §10.3, Ibn al-Sarrāj attributes to al-Axfaš the opinion that *ḥattā* and the following verb can be separated by a protasis. Al-Astarābādī quotes Ibn al-Sarrāj's views and some of his examples concerning *ḥattā*, but attributes to al-Axfaš the same opinion with regards to 'aw, namely that a protasis can come between 'aw and the following *manṣūb* verb, as in *lā 'asīru wallāhi 'aw 'idā qultu laka rkaḥ tarkaba* 'by God, I will surely not go, unless, when I tell you 'ride!', you will ride'.⁵⁰

Ibn Mālik, Abū Ḥayyān and al-Suyūṭī, on the other hand, claim that 'aw should not be separated from the following verb by either a *ẓarf* 'adverbial accusative of time and place' or a *ṣarf* 'protasis'. Al-Suyūṭī argues that such a separation is not possible, since 'aw is a conjunction that joins two non-separable elements (in this context, the second element is the *manṣūb* verb).⁵¹

6. CONCLUSION

'Aw is one of the words which may be followed by a *manṣūb* verb under certain conditions:

- a. When 'aw is a regular conjunction which joins two *manṣūb* verbs in a relationship of *'iṣrāk*.
- b. When 'aw joins two verbs and means *'illā 'an* (or, according to some, has one of the meanings of *ḥattā*: *'ilā 'an* or *kay*, mainly the former).
- c. When 'aw connects a noun and a verb, two elements not of the same kind, and the verb is thus *manṣūb*.

In this chapter groups b. and c. were discussed, but not group a., which differs substantially from the other two: in groups b. and c. the verb following 'aw is *manṣūb* due to an *'an muḍmara* (according to most grammarians), whereas in group a. it is *manṣūb* because it is joined to another *manṣūb* verb and they both share the same syntactic position.

The grammarians discuss the second group more at length than the third, and focus mainly on the meaning of 'aw in this context. All the meanings suggested for 'aw are of words following which *manṣūb* verbs occur under certain conditions: *'illā 'an* and *ḥattā* (the latter meaning

⁵⁰ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 61, 11–14.

⁵¹ See Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 231, 1–2; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1682, 3–5; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 117, 7–8; 118, 3–4.

either *'ilā 'an* or *kay*). This would appear to be an attempt by grammarians to combine an explanation of the *'i'rāb* (here: the *naṣb* mood of the verb following *'aw*) with the meaning of this conjunction in the context of *naṣb*: *'aw* followed by a *manṣūb* verb has the same meaning as other particles which may be followed by such a verb.

As for the third group, Sībawayhi already distinguishes it clearly from the second group. Other grammarians, on the other hand, do not always make such a clear distinction.

CHAPTER SIX

FA-

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to *fa-*, one of the conjunctions following which the verb is *manṣūb* under certain conditions. The discussion in this chapter will be quite lengthy and involved, due mainly to the complex conditions under which *naṣb* is used, according to the grammarians.

Early grammarians rarely discuss sentences in which *fa-* connects a noun and a verb in the *naṣb* mood (Sibawayhi not at all and al-Farrā' only rather briefly); later grammarians, from the time of Ibn Mālik, do treat this sentence type, in which *fa-* is taken as denoting its regular meaning as a conjunction and the *naṣb* mood is explained as due to '*atf*' between two disparate elements, viz. a noun and a verb. This principle applies not only to *fa-*, but to the other conjunctions, too; for details see appendix A, §2. Interestingly enough, all grammarians, including Sibawayhi and al-Farrā', discuss this type of '*atf*' with respect to the conjunctions '*aw*' and '*wa-*' in some detail, but *fa-* in this context is found mainly in later sources.

1.1. *Sibawayhi*

In chapter 241 (Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 15–378, 9) Sibawayhi discusses *fa-* at length. He goes into considerable detail about the different possible meanings of a following *manṣūb* verb, the '*an muḍmara*' which induces *naṣb*, and the syntactic environments in which the verb can also take *raf'*. It is one of the more complicated chapters in this masterpiece.

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

In his *Ma'ānī* al-Farrā' refers to numerous occurrences of an imperfect verb following *fa-*; some take *naṣb*, others take *raf'*, and in yet others both moods are possible. Al-Farrā''s and Sibawayhi's views are not easily compared, mainly because al-Farrā''s *Ma'ānī* deals with grammatical problems found in Qur'ānic verses and is not a grammar book *per se*, like Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*. Nevertheless, a thorough examination of al-Farrā''s views reveals that there are quite a few points of resemblance between the two, but also

some differences. The most important difference concerns the question of what induces *naṣb* following *fa*-. Sībawayhi contends that the mood is due to an 'an *muḍmara* while al-Farrā' holds the view that it is due to *xilāf*.

1.3. Other grammarians

Many other early and later grammarians also devote long discussions to *fa*- and the mood of the following verb. Some emphasize that this is a very complex and difficult topic.¹ One of the most extensive chapters devoted to *fa*- is found in Ibn Jinnī's *Sirr šinā'at al-'i'rāb*.² Later grammarians who treat *fa*- at length and refer to different points related to the mood of the following verb, are Ibn 'Uṣfūr in his commentary on al-Zajjājī's *Jumal*, Ibn Mālik and Abū Ḥayyān.³ The relevant references to their works and others appear in the relevant sections of this chapter.

1.4. Secondary sources

Modern scholars have treated *fa*- followed by imperfect verbs in *raf'* or *naṣb* rather extensively. One excellent recent study is Ba'albakī's detailed article on the mood of the verb following *fa*- according to early grammarians, in which he shows that Sībawayhi and subsequent grammarians differ greatly on this topic (Ba'albakī, *Fā*). *Al-Naḥw al-wāfi* contains a detailed description of many theories on *fa*-, based on grammarians' books (although exact references are seldom given there).⁴ Dévényi wrote an article devoted to a comparison between Sībawayhi's and al-Farrā's treatment of *hattā* and *fa*-. It presents only a sample of Sībawayhi's and al-Farrā's complex views and theories, and concludes that Sībawayhi pays more attention to the 'amal 'grammatical effect', whereas al-Farrā focuses more on the meanings of the syntactic structures.⁵ The present chapter will present a more detailed comparison between these two grammarians, based on a perusal of their complete views and theories on *fa*-, the sentence types in which it is followed by a *manṣūb* verb and its mean-

¹ See, for example, al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 380, 14–15.

² See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 269–276 (there the author treats *naṣb* following *fa*-, but that is only one section of a chapter devoted to *fa*- in various contexts and meanings).

³ See especially Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 143–155; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 122–134; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 27–35; 39–48; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1668–1677; 1682–1689. Ibn Hišām, who usually discusses topics at considerable extent, surprisingly does not refer at all to *fa*- followed by *naṣb* in his *Muḡnī*, a work devoted to Arabic particles. For his discussion of *fa*- and its different meanings, see Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 128–133.

⁴ See Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 352–374.

⁵ See especially Dévényi, *al-Farrā*, 105–106.

ing in these syntactic environments. It also provides a survey of the main opinions among later grammarians.

2. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING FA-

2.1. *Sibawayhi*

At the beginning of chapter 241 on *fa-*, *Sibawayhi* refers to the mood of the verb following this conjunction: *i'lam 'anna mā ntaṣaba fī bābi l-fā'i yantaṣibu 'alā 'iḍmāri 'an wamā lam yantaṣib fa'innahu...* 'know that what takes *naṣb* (i.e. the *manṣūb* verb) in the chapter [dealing with] *fa-* is *manṣūb* due to the concealing of *'an* [in the speaker's mind]. That which does not take *naṣb* is...'.⁶ In other words, according to *Sibawayhi* there are two possibilities for the mood of the verb following *fa-*:

- a. *Naṣb* due to an *'an muḍmara* (see §2.1.1)
- b. A mood that is not *naṣb* (see §2.1.2)

To judge by the subsequent text, possibility b. would seem not to be limited to *rafʿ* and *jazm* alone, but to apply to all three moods (*rafʿ*, *naṣb* and *jazm*), depending on the mood of the preceding verb. The expression *wamā lam yantaṣib* in the above quotation thus means *wamā lam yantaṣib 'alā 'iḍmāri 'an* 'that which does not take *naṣb* due to the concealing of *'an* [but rather due to other '*awāmil*]'. This refers to cases other than *naṣb* induced by an *'an muḍmara*, since the mood of the verb following *fa-* corresponds to the mood of the preceding verb (see §2.1.2).

Later in the same chapter *Sibawayhi* mentions another way to account for the *rafʿ* mood following *fa-*, namely through *inqitāʿ*, discussed in §2.1.3.

The mood of the verb following *fa-* can thus be explained in a number of ways: for *rafʿ* two explanations are possible (see §§2.1.2–2.1.3); the same is true for *naṣb* (see §§2.1.1–2.1.2); for *jazm*, only one explanation is possible (see §2.1.2).

2.1.1. *The naṣb mood induced by 'an muḍmara (for Sibawayhi's theory of 'an muḍmara see §7.1)*

The sentence types in which *naṣb* is induced by an *'an muḍmara* are the main topic of discussion in this chapter. *Sibawayhi*'s basic example,

⁶ See *Sibawayhi, Kitāb I*, 372, 15–17.

which he uses as the starting point for most of his discussions, is *mā ta'tīnī fatuḥaddītanī* (for the meanings of this sentence, see §3.1.1.2).⁷

2.1.2. *Any of the three moods (rafʿ, naṣb and jazm) may occur, depending on the mood of the verb preceding fa-*

The guiding principle here is that *fa-* is used as a regular conjunction which connects two imperfect verbs. According to Sibawayhi these two verbs occupy the same syntactic position and thus take the same mood. In this case two possibilities can be distinguished with respect to the *'awāmil* and the grammatical effect: either there is *'iṣrāk* or the verb is *marfūʿ* because it is in a position which a noun can occupy.⁸

- a. In the case of *'iṣrāk* the verb following *fa-* is under the syntactic influence of the *'āmil* of the preceding verb. In other words, the syntactic position of the verbs preceding and following *fa-* is identical, due to the influence of the same *'āmil*. For Sibawayhi's thorough discussion and relevant examples, see appendix A, §5.1.
- b. The verb may also be *marfūʿ* because it is in a position which a noun can occupy. According to Sibawayhi a verb following *fa-* may occur in a position which one of the following three grammatical elements can occupy: a *mubtada'* 'subject of a nominal sentence', a *mabniyy 'alā l-mubtada'* 'predicate of a nominal sentence'⁹ or any noun other than these two.¹⁰

⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 17ff.

⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 15–18. It seems to me that in these lines, which occur at the beginning of chapter 241, Sibawayhi treats only the possibility in which *fa-* is used as a regular conjunction that connects two imperfect verbs, and not the possibility of *inqitāʿ*, which is discussed only later (see §2.1.3). See also note 10 below.

⁹ *Al-Mabniyy 'alā l-mubtada'* is what is added to the subject of a nominal sentence to make the sentence complete; in other words, the predicate. For an extensive discussion of the use of this term in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*, see Levin, *Mabniyy*, 308–311 (§3.2.1).

¹⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 16–17. As mentioned in note 8 above, it seems to me that here Sibawayhi refers only to the possibility of *fa-* used as a regular conjunction connecting two imperfect verbs, and not to the possibility of *inqitāʿ*, since the latter would only fit the second of the three cases which Sibawayhi mentions here, namely the verb's occurrence in the position of a *mabniyy 'alā l-mubtada'*. In other words, if one understands Sibawayhi's statement here as reflecting the possibility of *inqitāʿ*, one cannot explain what he means in the first and third cases mentioned above. On the other hand, these three cases are fully explained if Sibawayhi's reference is interpreted as a claim that the *rafʿ* mood of the verb following *fa-* is due to its occurrence in nominal position, just like the preceding verb to which it is attached.

Some grammarians and modern scholars contend that this is where Sibawayhi begins his discussion of the possibility of *inqitāʿ*. Instead of confronting the problem posed by the first and the third cases as discussed above, they simply ignore them. See, for example,

Sībawayhi gives no examples of possibility b. in the chapter devoted to *fa-*, presumably because these would consist of indicative sentences denoting certainty, in which no element is joined to the first verb preceding *fa-* (unlike possibility a., in which such an element is found and is taken as influencing both verbs), whereas *naṣb* in the verb following *fa-* may only occur when the preceding sentence is not an indicative sentence that denotes certainty (see §4.1).

The examples in chapter 236, devoted to the *ʿāmil* inducing the imperfect verb to take *rafʿ*,¹¹ can give an indication of the kind of sentences Sībawayhi has in mind here.¹² Explicit statements on this point by subsequent grammarians like al-Mubarrad, Ibn al-Sarrāj and al-Sīrāfi support this view (see note 26 in §2.3.2).

2.1.3. *Inqītāʿ as an explanation for the rafʿ mood of the verb following fa-*
Inqītāʿ basically means that the *rafʿ* mood of the verb following *fa-* is due to the fact that this verb introduces a new sentence. It is thus the predicate

al-Fārisi, *Taʿlīq* II, 150, 1–9. Baʿalbakī, too, believes that Sībawayhi starts his discussion of *inqītāʿ* here. In order to explain the first case (in which the verb is *marfūʿ* since it occupies the position of a *mubtadaʿ*), Baʿalbakī hypothesizes that Sībawayhi refers to sentences like [*mā taʿtīnī*] *fa-l-ḥadīṭu minka* '[you do not come to me,] but there is a conversation from your side'. See Baʿalbakī, *Fāʿ*, 193–194. As explained above, a better and more adequate explanation seems to be that Sībawayhi here refers to cases in which the verb following *fa-* takes *rafʿ* because both that verb and the preceding one occupy the position of a noun. His explanation of *inqītāʿ* starts only later in chapter 241.

¹¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 363, 15–364, 5 and especially 364, 1–5.

¹² An example of the first case (the verb following *fa-* taking the *rafʿ* mood because it is in the position of a *mubtadaʿ*) is *yaqūlu fayuhaddīṭu Zaydun* 'Zayd says and converses'. In this sentence the verbs preceding and following *fa-* take *rafʿ* because they are both in a position which a *mubtadaʿ* can occupy, e.g. *'axūka Zaydun* 'your brother is Zayd'.

An example of the second case (the verb following *fa-* taking the *rafʿ* mood because it is in the position of a *mabniyy 'alā l-mubtadaʿ*), is *Zaydun yaqūlu fayuhaddīṭu* 'Zayd says and converses'. In this sentence the verbs preceding and following *fa-* take *rafʿ* because they are both in a position which a *mabniyy 'alā l-mubtadaʿ* can occupy, e.g. *Zaydun 'axūka* 'Zayd is your brother'.

Examples of the third case (the verb following *fa-* taking the *rafʿ* mood because it is in a position which a noun other than a *mubtadaʿ* and a *mabniyy 'alā l-mubtadaʿ* can occupy), are *marartu birajulin yaqūlu fayuhaddīṭu* 'I passed by a man saying and conversing' (both verbs preceding and following *fa-* take *rafʿ* because they are in a position which a *majrūr* noun can occupy, e.g. *marartu birajulin ṭawīlin* 'I passed by a tall man'); *ḥādā Zaydun yaqūlu fayuhaddīṭu* 'here is Zayd saying and conversing' (both verbs preceding and following *fa-* take *rafʿ* because they are in a position which a *manṣūb* noun in a position of *ḥāl* 'circumstantial clause' can occupy, e.g. *ḥādā Zaydun muntaliqan* 'Here is Zayd going away'); *ḥasibtuhu yaṇṭaliqun fayuhaddīṭu* 'I thought he was going away and conversing' (both verbs preceding and following *fa-* take *rafʿ* because they are in a position which a *manṣūb* noun in a position of the second object of the verb *ḥasibtu* can occupy, e.g. *ḥasibtuhu muntaliqan* 'I thought he was going away').

of a new sentence, from which the subject (a personal or demonstrative pronoun) was omitted. For Sībawayhi's thorough discussion and relevant examples, see appendix A, §4.1.

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' discusses the mood of the verb following *fa-* in commentaries on relevant Qur'ānic verses. The main discussion can be found in his commentary on the first Qur'ānic verse with a *maṣṣūb* verb following *fa-*: Qur'ān 2:35. Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, posits three possible explanations for the mood of the verb following *fa-*. These correspond to Sībawayhi's three possibilities discussed in §§2.1.1–2.1.3 above: *naṣb*, *'iṣrāk* and *inqiṭā'*. The two grammarians, however, disagree as to what induces *naṣb* in the first possibility (see §7), and use different terminology. The following is a concise description of al-Farrā''s views on the three above-mentioned possible explanations for the mood of the verb following *fa-*.

2.2.1. *The naṣb mood*

When the utterance following *fa-* is introduced by a *maṣṣūb* verb, al-Farrā' usually calls it *jawāb*¹³ or *jawāb naṣb*.¹⁴ The term *jawāb* denotes an utterance that follows another utterance. For details, see appendix A, §6.

2.2.2. *Any of the three moods (raf', naṣb and jazm) may occur, depending on the mood of the verb preceding fa-*

Unlike Sībawayhi who gives two possibilities (see §2.1.2), al-Farrā' refers only to the first of the two, to which he gives the name *'itbā'*. His explanation is the same as Sībawayhi's: *fa-* is used as a regular conjunction which connects two imperfect verbs that occupy the same syntactic position. The verb following *fa-* thus takes the same mood as the preceding verb, and therefore the three moods (*raf'*, *naṣb* and *jazm*) are possible. For an explanation and examples of *'itbā'*, see appendix A, §5.2.

2.2.3. *Isti'nāf as an explanation for the raf' mood of the verb following fa-*
What al-Farrā' calls *isti'nāf* is equivalent to Sībawayhi's *inqiṭā'*. Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, explains that *fa-* introduces a new sentence, unconnected to the preceding one, and therefore the verb following *fa-* takes *raf'*. He first mentions *isti'nāf* in his commentary on the above-mentioned Qur'ān

¹³ See, for example, al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 64, 7; 477, –1; 478, 1–2.

¹⁴ See, for example, al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 26, 12.

2:35.¹⁵ For an explanation and additional examples of *isti'nāf* according to al-Farrā', see appendix A, §4.2.

2.3. Other grammarians

2.3.1. The terminology associated with *fa-* followed by a verb in the *naṣb* mood

Grammarians use three different terms to denote *fa-* followed by *naṣb*. Most use the name *fā' al-jawāb*, and a few others call it *fā' al-jazā'*. The term *al-fā' al-sababiyya* is used only by later grammarians. Here are the details:

- a. Most grammarians use the term *fā' al-jawāb* '*fa-* of the utterance following another utterance',¹⁶ including al-Farrā' (see §2.2.1 above). Ibn al-Sarrāj explains that since an utterance in which the verb following *fa-* takes *naṣb* is similar in meaning to *jawāb al-jazā'* (the apodosis), the former is also called *jawāb*.¹⁷ According to al-Rummānī's *Hudūd*, *al-jawāb bil-fā'* is equivalent in meaning to a conditional clause attached to the utterance preceding *fa-*. He gives the example *lā tadnu minā l-'asadi faya'kulaka* 'do not come close to the lion lest it eat you!' which has a meaning equivalent to *lā tadnu minā l-'asadi fa'innaka 'in tadnu minhu ya'kuluka* 'do not come close to the lion, because if you come close to it, it will eat you!'.¹⁸ The same grammarian says in his *Ma'ānī l-ḥurūf* that the *jawāb* introduced by *fa-* can be of two kinds: in one the verb following *fa-* is *manṣūb* (this is the main topic of this chapter), while in the other the utterance following *fa-* is new, unconnected to the preceding clause, and functions as the apodosis of a conditional

¹⁵ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 27, 6–8.

¹⁶ See, for example, al-Axḡaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 221, 2 last lines; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 14–24; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 179, 3–4; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 22, 7; 196, 10–197, 4; al-Fārisī, *ʾIdāḥ* I, 167, 9–11; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣḡbīlī, *Wāḡiḥ*, 110–111; al-Jawḡarī, *Tāj* II, 576, 14–17; al-Harawī, *ʿAzḡiya*, 241, 5–6; al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 10ff.; Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, *Šarḡ* II, 33, 16; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḡ al-taṡḡīl* II.2, 44, 10 (Ibn Mālik also uses the terms *al-fā' lil-sababiyya* and *fā' al-sabab*; see notes 23 and 24, respectively); Ibn al-Nāḡim, *Šarḡ*, 482, 1.

¹⁷ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 183, 10–11. Al-Fārisī has a similar explanation, but emphasizes that there is an important syntactic difference between sentences in which the verb following *fa-* is *manṣūb* and conditional clauses: the former are one sentence, whereas the latter consist of two sentences (a protasis and an apodosis). See al-Fārisī, *ʾIdāḥ* II, 1066, –1–1067, 2. Cf. al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṡid* II, 1067, 4–17.

¹⁸ See al-Rummānī, *Hudūd*, 44, 4–6. For Sibawayḡi's extensive discussion of this example, its meaning and the possibility of expressing it using a *jawāb* in *jazm*, see §5.1.

sentence.¹⁹ Al-Baṭalyawsī similarly calls the utterance introduced by *fa-* with a *maṣṣūb* verb *al-šarṭ al-ma'nawīyy* 'a condition in meaning', in contrast to an actual conditional clause, which he calls *al-šarṭ al-lafẓīyy* 'the condition in form'.²⁰ For a comparison between the meanings of these two utterance types, see §3.3.

- b. I found the term *fā' al-jazā'* in only two sources.²¹ Literally, this term means '*fa-* of the requital' (for a discussion of *jazā'*, see appendix A, §7). The term is probably related to the conditional meaning which grammarians attribute to *fa-* followed by *naṣb*.
- c. The term *al-fā' al-sababiyya*, which is today rather common, was introduced by later grammarians (for a discussion of *sababiyya*, see appendix A, §12). There are a number of variants of this term: *al-fā' al-sababiyya*,²² *al-fā' lil-sababiyya*,²³ and *fā' al-sabab*.²⁴ It is noteworthy that later grammarians use these terms not only to indicate *fa-* followed by a *maṣṣūb* verb, but rather any *fa-* between two connected clauses, as in the conditional sentence 'in *yuslim Zaydun fahuwa yadxulu l-jannata* 'if Zayd becomes Muslim, then he will enter paradise'.²⁵

2.3.2. *Any of the three moods (raf', naṣb and jazm) may occur, depending on the mood of the verb preceding fa-*

Unlike Sibawayhi with his two possibilities (see §2.1.2), and in line with al-Farrā' (see §2.2.2), most grammarians refer only to the possibility of 'iṣrāk',²⁶ which they explain in the same manner as Sibawayhi: *fa-* is used

¹⁹ See al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 43–47 and especially 43, –5–3. Cf. al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) VIII, 5288a, 4ff.

²⁰ See al-Baṭalyawsī, *Iṣlāḥ*, 254, 7–255, 11.

²¹ See al-Naḍr b. Šumayl, *Risāla*, 164, –3–2 (fourth kind of *fa-*); al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) VIII, 5288a, 4–5, where the author says that this term is a synonym of *fā' al-jawāb* (see a. above).

²² See, for example, al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 66, 4; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīt* II, 1568a, 4–9. Ibn Hišām uses the possessive phrase *fā' al-sababiyya*. See Ibn Hišām, *ʿAwdaḥ* II, 81, 4; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 71, 3; Ibn Hišām, *Jāmi'*, 173, 2.

²³ See, for example, al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 13, 12–13; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 28, 13–14; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʿumda*, 337, 9; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 321, 2–3.

²⁴ See, for example, Ibn Mālik, *Taṣḥīl*, 231, 5–11; al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 226, 12–13, who uses *fā' al-sabab al-jawābiyya*; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1674, 5, who has *al-fā' lil-sabab*; al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 388, 16–18; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 118, 6.

²⁵ See, for example, Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *ʿAmālī* I, 123–124 ('*imlā'* 11) and especially 123, 10–14; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 66, 3ff.

²⁶ Two exceptions are al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj, who follow Sibawayhi's view that the verb can be *marfū'* because it occurs in a position which a noun can occupy (see §2.1.2-b and note 10). See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 14, 4–7; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 154, 7–8; 153, 13–15. See also al-Sīrāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, l. 4; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 27, 6–8.

as a regular conjunction which connects two imperfect verbs occupying the same syntactic position.²⁷

2.3.3. *Explaining the raf' mood of the verb following fa- as due to this verb introducing a new utterance*

Sībawayhi calls this *inqiṭā'* and al-Farrā' gives it the name *isti'nāf* (see §2.1.3 and §2.2.3, respectively). For a thorough discussion and relevant examples by several grammarians, see appendix A, §4.3.

3. SENTENCE TYPES IN WHICH A *MANṢŪB* VERB CAN FOLLOW FA- AND THE MEANING OF *NAṢB*

3.1. *Sībawayhi*

After explaining the different possibilities of the mood of the verb following *fa-* (see §2.1) and the *'āmil* inducing the *naṣb* mood (an *'an muḍmara*, as explained in §7.1), Sībawayhi arrives at the main subject of the chapter devoted to *fa-*: the sentence types in which this conjunction can be followed by *naṣb* and their meanings. The first and main part of Sībawayhi's discussion is devoted to sentences in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative. He subsequently treats additional sentence types, in which a *manṣūb* verb can follow *fa-* under certain conditions.

Before going into detail, three remarks are in order:

- a. As explained in §2.1 and especially in §2.1.2, a *manṣūb* verb may follow *fa-* when the latter is a regular conjunction connecting two imperfect verbs. In this case the *naṣb* mood is not induced by an *'an muḍmara* but is due to the *'āmil* which induces this mood in the verb preceding *fa-*. This case will not be discussed here.
- b. Some of Sībawayhi's examples in which *fa-* is followed by a verb in *naṣb*, also admit a verb in *raf'*, which can be explained as due to *'iṣrāk* (see §2.1.2-a), *inqiṭā'* (see §2.1.3) and sometimes both. A perusal of all sentence types discussed by Sībawayhi reveals that in his view every *manṣūb* verb can also be *marfū'* due to *inqiṭā'*, whereas only some can be explained as due to *'iṣrāk*. In other words, *fa-* can always be taken as

²⁷ See, for example, al-Axfaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 222, 11–223, 3; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 14, 9; 16, –1; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 203, 6–8; al-Fārisī, *'Iḍāḥ* II, 1069, 3 last lines and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1070, 1–9; al-Warrāq, *'Ilal*, 275, 2–3; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 21–112, 1.

introducing a new utterance and so precedes a verb in *rafʿ*, but only in some sentences can *fa-* also be regarded as a conjunction connecting two verbs with the same syntactic status.

- c. A basic term which Sibawayhi and many subsequent grammarians use in their discussions of *fa-* followed by *naṣb* is *wājib*, which can be translated as an indicative sentence denoting certainty (for details, see appendix A, §15). Generally speaking, grammarians state that *naṣb* following *fa-* is possible only when the preceding utterance is not *wājib*.

3.1.1. *The utterance preceding fa- is negative*

3.1.1.1. *The different meanings that this sentence type may convey* At the beginning of his discussion of sentences in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative, Sibawayhi says that these can convey two different meanings. Before elaborating on these meanings, he states that the *naṣb* is in any case induced by the same *ʿāmil*, an *ʿan muḍmara*, whatever the meaning. As proof that in Arabic one form may have several meanings, Sibawayhi notes the verbal forms *yafʿalu* and *faʿala*, which may be used both in indicative sentences as well as in oaths.²⁸

3.1.1.2. *Sentences in which an imperfect verb is negated* Sibawayhi's main example of a sentence in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative is *mā ta'tinī fatuḥadditānī*, which he uses to explain the two meanings of this sentence type.

- a. The meaning *mā ta'tinī fakayfa tuḥadditunī* 'you do not come to me [at all], so how can you converse with me?'

Sibawayhi explains that according to this meaning, *law 'ataytanī laḥaddattānī* 'had you come to me, you would have conversed with me'.²⁹ From this remark it can be inferred that this meaning conveys an absolute

²⁸ For this discussion, see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 373, 17–19. Cf. Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 195, where the author explains Sibawayhi's words.

²⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 373, 2 last lines. For almost identical explanations, see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 16, 9; al-Zamakhsharī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 6–7; Ibn al-Ḥajīb, *Šarḥ* II, 16, 1–3; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 145, 7–9; 152, 5 last lines; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 264, 6–8.

For grammarians who explain this first meaning in a slightly different way, using a real (not hypothetical) conditional clause of the type *'in ta'tinī tuḥadditnī* 'if you come to me, you will converse with me', see al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 69, 19–24; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 95, 14–16.

For Ibn Mālik the meaning of the conditional can be either hypothetical, as it is for Sibawayhi and most grammarians (see Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 30, 14–17), or real (see Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 27, 13–15; 38, 16–20).

negation of the action denoted by the verb preceding *fa-*,³⁰ and that had it occurred, the action conveyed by the verb following *fa-* would have also occurred.³¹

Another example is *lā yuqḍā 'alayhim fayamūtū* 'it shall not be decreed them [to die], and [as a result] they will not die' (Qur'ān 35:36).³² According to Sībawayhi's above-mentioned explanation, the verse can be understood as 'it shall not [at all] be decreed them [to die], so how will they die?'.³³

b. The meaning *mā ta'tīnī 'abadan 'illā lam tuḥadditnī* 'you never come to me unless when you do not converse with me'

Sībawayhi explains that according to this meaning, *minka 'ityānun kaṭīrun walā ḥadīṭun minka* 'from your side (literally: from you) there is a frequent coming [to me], but there is no conversation [with me]'.³⁴ From this explanation it is inferred that the verb preceding *fa-* does not involve the absolute negation of the action, but on the contrary, that this action occurs frequently, although without leading to the occurrence denoted by the verb following *fa-*.³⁵ In the above-mentioned example the meaning is

³⁰ For grammarians who say this explicitly, see al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 202, 10–12; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 43, 2 last lines.

³¹ See al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, ll. 9–10 (cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 710, 3–4, where the author provides exactly the same explanation without explicitly mentioning al-Sirāfi by name as the source). See also al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) II, 233, 7–9; al-Warrāq, *ʿIlal*, 274, 17–18; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 273, 1–6; Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 352, 15–16; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 934, 18–20; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1683, 8–9; Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 940, 12–17, where the author argues that this meaning conveys *ta'ajjub* 'wonder'.

³² See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 3.

³³ For grammarians who explicitly say that this is the meaning of the verse, see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 18, 1–3; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) II, 91, 10–11; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šudūr*, 274, 4–6. Cf. Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 357, 2 last lines; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 934, 24–935, 1; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 69, 19–24; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 30, 14–17. See also Howell, *Grammar* II, 26, 10–15.

³⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 373, 1–374, 1. For similar explanations see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 16, 6; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufašṣal*, 110, 7–8; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 44, 1; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 934, 17–18; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 30, 3 last lines.

³⁵ For grammarians who say this explicitly, see al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 202, 1–203, 1; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) II, 233, 2 last lines; al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, ll. 10–12 (cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 710, 4–6, where the author provides exactly the same explanation without explicitly mentioning al-Sirāfi by name as the source); al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1067, 18–1068, 3.

Ibn al-Ḥājjib, on the other hand, argues that in sentences such as *mā ta'tīnī fatuḥadditānī* there is no evidence that the action conveyed by the verb preceding *fa-* occurs frequently. In his view, Sībawayhi's interpretation *minka 'ityānun kaṭīrun* is meant merely to emphasize that this action can occur, in contrast to the action denoted by the verb following *fa-* which is absolutely negated. See Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 16, 3–17, 5.

thus 'you [frequently] come to me, but when you come to me you never converse with me'.

Later in chapter 241, when Sibawayhi deals with sentences in which there is an exception clause with *'illā* following the *manṣūb* verb (see §3.1.1.4), he clarifies the meaning discussed in this section with another utterance: *mā ta'tīnī muḥaddītan* 'you do not come to me while conversing [with me].'³⁶ Both of Sibawayhi's explanations of this meaning (*mā ta'tīnī 'abadan 'illā lam tuḥaddītnī* and *mā ta'tīnī muḥaddītan*) convey the meaning 'you do come to me, but never while conversing with me'.³⁷

3.1.1.3. *Sentences in which a perfect verb is negated* Following his discussion of *mā ta'tīnī fatuḥaddītanī* with its two possible meanings, Sibawayhi goes on to treat examples like *mā 'ataytanā fatuḥaddītanā*, in which the verb preceding *fa-* is also negated.³⁸ In this case, however, the verb preceding *fa-* is in the perfect form, and thus differs from the (imperfect) verb that follows *fa-*, although the latter is *manṣūb*, exactly as in *mā ta'tīnī fatuḥaddītanī*.³⁹ However, if in such sentences the verb following *fa-* takes *raf'* (i.e. *mā 'ataytanā fatuḥaddīṭunā* and *mā ta'tīnī fatuḥaddīṭunī*), it makes a difference if the verb preceding *fa-* is in the perfect or the imperfect form. The *raf'* mood in the verb following *fa-* is then reasonable and probable in the latter, and so are its two possible explanations (*'iṣrāk* and *inqiṭā'*; see §2.1.2-a and §2.1.3, respectively), whereas *raf'* in the former is less probable than *naṣb*, and so are its two possible explanations. Here is Sibawayhi's discussion of the less probable possibility of *raf'* in sentences like *mā 'ataytanā fatuḥaddīṭunā*.

According to Sibawayhi there are two possible explanations for the *raf'* mood in *mā 'ataytanā fatuḥaddīṭunā*. It can be argued that the meaning

³⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 18–19. For other grammarians who provide this explanation as well see, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 203, 1–2, 1; al-Sirāfī, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) II, 233, 2 last lines; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 272, 13–16; Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 352, 12–13; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 145, 10–11; 153, 1–2 and Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 264, 9–10, where the author explains that the meaning of *mā ta'tīnā fatuḥaddītanā* is *mā ta'tīnā muḥaddītan bal ta'tī ḡayra muḥaddīṭin* 'you do not come to us while conversing [with us], but rather come [to us] while not conversing [with us]'; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣhīl* II.2, 27, 15–16; 38, 5 last lines; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1683, 7; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 95, 16–96, 2; Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 940, 10–11.

³⁷ In al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 16, 7–8 and 18, 4–6, a third utterance is used to explain this meaning: *kullamā 'ataytanī lam tuḥaddītnī* 'whenever you came to me, you did not converse with me'. See also Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 352, 12–13.

³⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 1–2. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 712, 3–4, where the author probably copies al-Sirāfī's words, as he does elsewhere in this chapter (see notes 31, 35, 39 and 41 for similar cases).

³⁹ See also al-Sirāfī, *Šarḥ* (*Būlāq*) I, 419, 2–6 (cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 711, 9–10, where the author provides exactly the same explanation without explicitly mentioning al-Sirāfī by name as the source).

is [*mā 'ataytanā*] *fa'anta tuḥadditunā l-sā'ata* 'you did not come to us, but there you are conversing with us now'. In this case, the mood is due to *inqiṭā'*: the utterance following *fa-* is new and unconnected to the previous one. The sentence can also mean *mā 'ataytanā famā tuḥadditunā* 'you neither came to us nor conversed with us'; in that case the mood is explained as due to *'iṣrāk*. However, Sibawayhi notes that *naṣb* is more probable than *raf'* with its two possible explanations, because the latter mood is a deviation from the ordinary and usual way of speech,⁴⁰ since it involves connecting two verbs of different nature and form (a perfect and an imperfect verb). He adds that in order to express the idea conveyed by *raf'* one should say *mā 'ataytanā faḥaddatānā*, in which two perfect verbs are connected by *fa-*. According to Sibawayhi it is not good (in Sibawayhi's formulation: *ḍa'ufa* 'it was [linguistically] weak') to join *tuḥadditunā* (an imperfect verb) to *'ataytanā* (a perfect verb), just as it is not good to join a verb to a noun, as in *mā 'anta minnā fataṣṣurunā* 'you are not [one] of us and you do not assist us' (sentences of this type are discussed in §3.1.1.5). In both types, putting the verb following *fa-* in *raf'* is considered not good, since the elements preceding and following *fa-* are not equivalent. Nevertheless, Sibawayhi concludes, *raf'* in sentences such as *mā 'ataytanā fatuḥadditunā* is possible despite its weakness, when the speakers make the imperfect verb *tuḥadditunā* fit into the position of the verb *'ataytanā*, because this latter occupies the position of an imperfect verb in the sentence.⁴¹

3.1.1.4. *Sentences in which an exception phrase or clause with 'illā follows the maṣṣūb verb* Examples of this type can be divided into two kinds. The exception can be either a noun (or an utterance which occupies the position of a noun) or a clause.

a. Sentences in which the exception with *'illā* is a noun

Sibawayhi's first example of this kind is *mā ta'tinā fataḥadditunā* (i.e. *fata-takallama*) *'illā bil-jamīl* which he explains as meaning *lam ta'tinā 'illā takallamta bijamīl* 'you did not come to us unless when you spoke

⁴⁰ Sibawayhi uses the technical terms *al-wajh* and *ḥadd al-kalām*. For a discussion of these terms and their meaning in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*, see Levin, *Kāna*, 211, appendix II.

⁴¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 8–13. For a similar explanation see al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 419, 6ff. Cf. al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, ll. 18ff., where only a part of al-Sirāfi's relevant words are recorded; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 711, 10–15, where the author provides exactly the same explanation without explicitly mentioning al-Sirāfi by name as the source.

courteously'.⁴² It can be thus inferred that the exception does not apply only to the noun following it in the literal utterance, but also to the action denoted by the verb following *fa-*. Sibawayhi adds that *rafʿ* in such an example is also possible, through *širka* (that is, *ʾišrāk*). *Mā ta'tinā fatakal-lamu ʾillā bil-jamīli* thus means *mā ta'tinā famā takallamu ʾillā bil-jamīli* 'you do not come to us and you do not speak other than courteously', since both verbs connected by *fa-* are negated by *mā*.⁴³

His second example is the following line of poetry:⁴⁴ *wamā qāma minnā qā'imun fī nadiyyinā / fayantīqa ʾillā billatī hiya ʾa'rafu* 'no one of us stood in our gathering unless he spoke in a way to be the most known [as right]'⁴⁵.⁴⁶ In this verse the exception is *billatī hiya ʾa'rafu*, an utterance equivalent to a prepositional phrase: the preposition *bi-* and the clause (*a*)*llatī hiya ʾa'rafu*, which is equivalent to a *majrūr* noun.

b. Sentences in which the exception with *ʾillā* is a clause

Sibawayhi's first example of this kind of sentence is *lā ta'tinā fatuḥadditanā ʾillā zdadnā fika raġbatan* 'you do not come to us and [as a result] you do not converse with us unless when we desire you more (literally: unless when we increase in our desire for you)'. He emphasizes that the *naṣb* mood here has the same function as in *mā ta'tinā fatuḥadditanā*, where its meaning is *mā ta'tinā muḥadditan* (the second meaning discussed in §3.1.1.2-b). The meaning of the above-mentioned example is therefore *mā ʾataytanā muḥadditan ʾillā zdadtu fika raġbatan* 'you did not come to me while conversing [with me] unless when I desired you'.⁴⁷

His second example is the following line of poetry:⁴⁸ *wamā ḥalla Sa'diyyun ġariban bibaldatin / fayunsaba ʾillā l-Zibriqān lahu ʾabu* 'no one of the tribe of Sa'd camped as a foreigner next to a village other than when he was asked about his genealogy, al-Zibriqān is his father (that is, unless

⁴² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 13.

⁴³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 14–15.

⁴⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 15–17.

⁴⁵ This addition is according to Jahn's translation and al-Šantamarī's explanation. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 153, 7; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 713, 3–4; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 387–388 (verse 591) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 420. Cf. al-Šantamarī quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 87, note 15 of chapter 241.

⁴⁶ A verse in the *tawīl* meter, by al-Farazdaq.

⁴⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 18–20. Note that Sibawayhi's example and explanation do not accord in negative particle, tense or person (both of the sentences' subjects and the pronouns attached to the verbs following *fa-*), but there is no doubt as to his intention in this explanation.

⁴⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 20–21. Cf. Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taḥṣīl* II.2, 31, –1–32, 7; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 72, 8–10; Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 942, –2–943, 2.

his father's name is explicitly mentioned)'.⁴⁹ In this verse the exception is (a)l-Zibriqān lahu 'abu, a complete nominal clause.

3.1.1.5. *Sentences in which a nominal sentence with no verb is negated* This sentence type differs substantially from those discussed in the previous sections, since here the negated utterance preceding *fa-* is not a verbal but a nominal sentence with no verb. Sibawayhi states that in sentences such as *mā 'anta minnā fatuḥaddītanā* 'you are not [one] of us and [as a result] you do not converse with us', the verb following *fa-* can also be *marfū'*, but only due to *inqiṭā'* and not to *'iṣrāk*. On the *naṣb* mood in the example he says that the verb following *fa-* cannot be taken to have been affected by the negation particle *mā*, because what precedes *fa-* (*mā 'anta minnā*) does not belong to the same category as the verb and is not similar to it (since it is a nominal sentence).⁵⁰

Another example is the following line of poetry:⁵¹ *mā 'anta min Qaysin fatanbaḥa dūnahā / walā min Tamīmin fī l-lahā wal-ḡalāsimi* 'you are not of [the tribe of] Qays and [as a result] you do not defend them,⁵² and you are not of the tribe of Tamīm with respect to the uvulas and the epiglottises.⁵³

3.1.2. *The utterance preceding fa- is a question, wish or desire*

Sentences of this type can be divided into two kinds: those in which the utterance preceding *fa-* contains a verb and those with no verb. It is noteworthy that in all the examples Sibawayhi records the utterance preceding

⁴⁹ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by al-La'īn al-Minqarī. Al-Šantamarī explains the verse's meaning as follows: al-Zibriqān is the head of the tribe of Sa'd. When someone of this tribe was asked about his genealogy, he referred to al-Zibriqān as his father. See al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 713, 5–8; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 388 (verse 592) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 420.

⁵⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 2–4. For a similar explanation see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 17, 5–7; al-Sīrāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 88, note 20 of chapter 241. Sibawayhi previously mentions an almost identical example: *mā 'anta minnā fatanṣuranā* 'you are not [one] of us and [as a result] you do not assist us' (the possibility of *raf'* in this example is mentioned in §3.1.1.3 above towards the end). See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 11.

⁵¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 4–6. Cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 17, 3 last lines; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 713, 9ff.; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 388 (verse 593) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 420.

⁵² Jahn translates *dūnahā* 'for them', and according to al-Šinqīṭī and Ba'albakī, *fatanbaḥa dūnahā* means '*fatudāfi'a 'anhā*' and 'stand up for them', respectively. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 153, 28; al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar*, 20, 5 (part of the explanation of verse 1027); Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 202, –7.

⁵³ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by al-Farazdaq. For the meaning of the verse see the references to al-Šantamarī's works in note 51 above; al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar*, 20 (verse 1027).

fa- is negative, whereas other grammarians provide both affirmative and negative examples.

3.1.2.1. *The meaning of this sentence type* Unlike the sentence type in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative and has two possible meanings, this sentence type has only one meaning, that of a conditional clause, like the first meaning discussed in §3.1.1.2-a. Sibawayhi explicitly says this in reference to *'alā taqa'u l-mā'a fatasbaḥa* (see §3.1.2.3-a below): the meaning of *naṣb* is *'idā waqa'ta sabaḥta*.⁵⁴

Two remarks are in order here on the sentence types in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative as compared to the one discussed here, in which it is a question, wish or the like:

- a. The second meaning of the former type, according to which the action denoted by the verb preceding *fa-* is not negated, but rather the following verb (see §3.1.1.2-b), is not possible in the latter, because questions and wishes are close in meaning to an absolute negation of the preceding verb, which is expressed in the first meaning.
- b. Sentences of both types can be rendered by a conditional clause, but in the former case the condition is hypothetical (with *law*), whereas in the latter it is real (with *'idā*). When the utterance preceding *fa-* is negated, the action denoted by the following verb is only hypothetical; only if the negation is removed the action of the verb following *fa-* is understood as having occurred. In questions and wishes referring to the future, however, the occurrence of the action denoted by the verb preceding *fa-* is possible and so is that of the following verb.⁵⁵

3.1.2.2. *Sentences in which the utterance preceding fa- does not contain a verb and denotes tamannī 'wish'* Sibawayhi's examples are *'alā mā'a fa'aṣrabahu* 'I wish there were water and [then] I would drink it'; *laytahu 'indanā fayuhaddītanā* 'I wish he were with us and [then] he would converse with us'; and a line of poetry: *'alā rasūla lanā minnā fayuxbiranā / mā bu'du ḡāyatinā min ra'si mujranā* 'I wish we had a messenger [who is

⁵⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 10–12. For another place from which the *naṣb* can be inferred as having a meaning equivalent to that of a conditional clause, see *ibid.*, 376, 1–2. See also Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 145, 16ff.

⁵⁵ In questions and wishes referring to the past, the occurrence of the action denoted by the verb preceding *fa-* is only hypothetical, as in negated sentences, and can therefore be represented by a hypothetical conditional clause. This is explicitly noted in al-Sirāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 153, 3–4.

one] of us and [then] he would notify us what is the distance between our destination (i.e. resurrection) and the beginning of our end'.⁵⁶ He remarks that in all these examples *našb* is compulsory, because the verb following *fa-* is not connected to a verb (but to a nominal utterance). However, it is not clear why in the similar sentence type in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is a negative nominal sentence (see §3.1.1.5), Sībawayhi rejects only *rafʿ* explained as due to *ʾiṣrāk*, but allows this mood due to *inqitāʿ*, whereas here he rejects *rafʿ* completely and allows only *našb*. I have not been able to find an answer to this problem.⁵⁷

3.1.2.3. Sentences in which the utterance preceding *fa-* contains a verb

a. The sentence *'alā taqa'u l-mā'a fatasbaḥa*⁵⁸

This is Sībawayhi's first example of this type which contains a verb in the clause before *fa-*. Unlike the sentence types and examples discussed so far, in which Sībawayhi first refers to the possibility of *našb* and only later, if at all, to *rafʿ*, in this example he first discusses *rafʿ* and only then mentions the possibility of *našb*. Perhaps this can be ascribed to the fact that the *rafʿ* mood here is more probable, as far as the meaning of the sentence is

⁵⁶ A verse in the *basīṭ* meter, by Umayya b. Abī l-Ṣalt. For the meaning of the verse see al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 389 (verse 594) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 420–421. See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 6–9. Cf. al-Sirāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 166–167 (verse 439), where the author provides Sībawayhi's explanation and the verse's context.

My translation of all three examples reflects the understanding that they denote wishes and not questions. This is also Ba'albakī's view (see Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 198–199, note 27). The most compelling evidence for this assumption is that in chapter 253, devoted to *jawāb* followed by *jazm*, Sībawayhi's examples of sentences denoting *tamannī* 'wish' are two sentences that are semantically identical to the two above-mentioned examples: *'alā mā'a 'ašrabhu* and *laytahu 'indanā yuḥaddiṭnā* (for a comparison between sentence types in which the *jawāb* following *fa-* is *majzūm* and *manšūb* see §5). Jahn, on the other hand, translates the first and third examples as denoting questions, not wishes. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 153, 32 and 153, 34, respectively.

⁵⁷ Cf. Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 199, where the author points out this difficulty and says that he found no solution for it. Other grammarians, like al-Mubarrad, explicitly say that in this sentence type *rafʿ* is possible if one conceives of *fa-* as introducing a new utterance (due to *inqitāʿ*). Al-Mubarrad's example is *'ayna baytuka fa'azūruka* 'where is your house and then [when you answer me] I will visit you?', in which *našb* is explained as *jawāb*, but *rafʿ* is also possible, i.e. *'ayna baytuka fa'azūruka*, when the meaning is *'ayna baytuka fa'anā 'azūruka* *'alā ḥālin* 'where is your house and [indeed] I will visit you sometime'. See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 21, 2 last lines. Cf. Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 146, 3–8.

⁵⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 9–12. Abū Ḥayyān, Ibn 'Aqīl and al-Suyūṭī remark that in this example the intended meaning is [*'alā taqa'u*] *fī l-mā'a* [*fatasbaḥa*], but the preposition *fī* is omitted and the verb *taqa'u* thus takes the direct object (*a*)*l-mā'a*. See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1672, 14–15; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 87, 2 last lines; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 123, 1–2. For the meaning of *waqa'a fī* 'to come or to arrive to a certain thing or place', see Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 3057, 1–4.

concerned; this, however, is only an assumption, since Sībawayhi is silent on this question.

Sībawayhi explains that the meaning of this sentence in *rafʿ* is *ʾalā taqaʿu l-māʾa faʾalā tasbaḥu* ‘do you not [want to] come to the water and do you not [want to] swim?’, as *ʾiṣrāk*. He then says that *naṣb* is also possible; the sentence *ʾalā taqaʿu l-māʾa fatasbaḥa* then means ‘do you not [want to] come to the water and [then] to swim?’. Sībawayhi states that the *taqdīr* structure of the latter is *ʾalā yakūnu wuqūʿun faʾan tasbaḥa* ‘is there no coming [to the water] and [then] that you swim?’ (for a discussion of the *taqdīr* structure according to Sībawayhi see §7.1).

b. The sentence *ʾalam taʾtinā fatuḥaddiṭnā*⁵⁹

In sentences of this type the verb following *fa-* can be in any one of the three moods. When the verb is in the *naṣb* mood the sentence has the meaning ‘did you not come to us and [as a result] did you not converse with us?’, *jazm* is possible due to *ʾiṣrāk*, the meaning of *ʾalam taʾtinā fatuḥaddiṭnā* being ‘did you not come to us and did you not converse with us?’, and *rafʿ* is explained as due to *inqiṭāʾ*, *ʾalam taʾtinā fatuḥaddiṭnā* thus meaning ‘did you not come to us? And there you are conversing with us’.

Sībawayhi then quotes a line of poetry with *naṣb*:⁶⁰ *ʾalam tasʾal fatuxbi-raka l-rusūmu / ʾalā Firtāja wal-ṭalalu l-qadīmu* ‘do you not ask and [then] the traces and the ancient remains [of the camp] will inform you of Firtāj (a name of a place)?’.⁶¹ Subsequently in the same chapter he quotes a line of poetry with a similar structure, in which the verb is *marfūʿ* due to *inqiṭāʾ*:⁶² *ʾalam tasʾali l-rabʾa l-qawāʾa fayantiqū / wahal tuxbiranka l-yawma baydāʾu samlaqu* ‘did you not ask the empty house? And there he talks. Will a dangerous bare desert inform you?’.⁶³ Sībawayhi says that in the latter case the action conveyed by the verb preceding *fa-* is not to be understood as giving the reason for the occurrence of the action conveyed by the following verb, but rather the second action occurs in

⁵⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 12–13.

⁶⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 13–15.

⁶¹ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by al-Burj b. Mashar (Sībawayhi does not give the name of the author of this verse; the identification is according to al-Sirāfi, *ʾAbyāt* II, 152, 2 last lines).

⁶² See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 16–20.

⁶³ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Jamīl b. ʿAbdallāh b. Maʾmar al-Quḍāʾī l-ʿUḍrī (see Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 161a, 14). For the context of this verse and some explanations of the words, see al-Sirāfi, *ʾAbyāt* II, 201–202 (verse 464); al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 715, 1–6; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 391 (verse 599) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 422. See also al-Baṭalyawṣī, *Šarḥ*, 263–266 (verse 94) and al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1904), 162.

any case; *faḡaṇṭiqu* here implies *fahuwa mimmā yaṇṭiqu* ‘and he is among what talks’.⁶⁴

c. The sentence ‘*alasta qad ‘ataytanā fatuḡhadditunā*’⁶⁵

In this example *naṣb* and *rafʿ* are possible. Sibawayhi contends that in the former case the meaning of the sentence is equivalent to that of a conditional clause. The example with *naṣb* can be translated similarly to the previous example discussed in b. above: ‘did you not come to us and [as a result] did you not converse with us?’. As for *rafʿ*, it is possible according to Sibawayhi when the speaker’s intention in *tuḡhadditunā* is to express the verb *ḡaddattanā*.⁶⁶ By this he means that *rafʿ* can be explained as due to ‘*isrāk*’ only when the imperfect verb following *fa-* is conceived by the speaker as a perfect verb; then it can be connected to the perfect verb preceding *fa-*. The meaning of ‘*alasta qad ‘ataytanā fatuḡhadditunā*’ is thus ‘did you not come to us and did you not converse with us?’.

3.1.3. *The utterance preceding fa- is a prohibition*

In this sentence type both *naṣb* and *jazm* are possible in the verb following *fa-*, the latter due to ‘*isrāk*’. Sibawayhi’s first example of this type is *lā tamdudhā fataṣuqqahā* ‘do not stretch it lest you tear it!’.⁶⁷ *Jazm* is also possible, and then the sentence is *lā tamdudhā fataṣquqhā* ‘do not stretch it and [do not] tear it!’.⁶⁸ Another example is *lā taftarū ‘alā llāhi kaḡiban fayuṣḡitakum bi‘aḡābin* ‘do not forge a lie against God lest he destroy you with a punishment!’ (Qurʾān 20:61).⁶⁹

3.1.4. *The utterance preceding fa- is a command*

Sibawayhi’s first example of this sentence type is *iʿtinī faʿuḡhadditaka* ‘come to me and [then] I will converse with you’, on which he does not

⁶⁴ Cf., for example, al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 27, 8–10; II, 229, 12–14; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 204, 2–4; al-Naḡḡās, *Ṣarḡ*, 161, 1–3; al-Naḡḡās, *ʿIrāb* III, 105, 1–4; al-Zamaxṣarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 112, 4–8.

⁶⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 1–2. It is unclear why Sibawayhi discusses two different sentence types (those consisting of prohibition and command; see §3.1.3 and §3.1.4) between the previous example of this sentence type (b. above) and this one. Baʿalbakī also raises this unanswered question (see Baʿalbakī, *Fāʾ*, 199).

⁶⁶ Cf. al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 154, 8–9.

⁶⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 15–16. The context of this sentence is not given, but one can assume that the attached pronouns refer to a certain cloth or linen.

⁶⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 16–17. As Baʿalbakī correctly remarks (see Baʿalbakī, *Fāʾ*, 200, note 30), Sibawayhi’s use of the form *taṣuqqahā* in the first possibility, which can theoretically reflect both *naṣb* and *jazm*, is only seemingly ambiguous, because his use of *taṣquqhā* in the second possibility shows that his use of *taṣuqqahā* should be interpreted as a *maṣṣūb* form.

⁶⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 16.

elaborate.⁷⁰ He then quotes a line of poetry: *yā nāqa sīrī 'anaqan fasihā / 'ilā Sulaymāna fanastarihā* 'O she-camel, go in a wide step to Sulaymān and [then] we will rest'.⁷¹

He subsequently states that in examples of this sentence type the verb cannot be *majzūm* (as *'išrāk*) due to the difference between the verbs preceding and following *fa-*, which therefore cannot be connected by this conjunction: while the imperative form ends in a permanent non-changing vowel (here: *sukūn*, zero vowel), the last vowel of the imperfect form is *ḥarf 'rāb*, a vowel which changes in accordance with the *'awāmil*.⁷²

On the other hand, *raf'* in such examples is possible due to *inqiṭā'*, as in *i'tinī fa'uḥaddituka*. Sibawayhi agrees with al-Xalīl that here it is not intended to make the action denoted by the verb preceding *fa-* the reason for the occurrence of the following verb (in other words, this sentence does not have the meaning of a conditional clause). The intention is rather to say *i'tinī fa'anā mimman yuḥaddituka l-battata ji'ta 'am lam taji'* 'come to me! And [indeed] I will certainly converse with you, whether you come or not (i.e. in any case the conversation will take place)'.⁷³

3.1.5. *The utterance preceding fa- is a hypothetical clause; only if it had occurred would the utterance following fa- also have occurred*

In sentences of this type the clause preceding *fa-* did not occur in reality, and the *naṣb* mood following *fa-* conveys the idea that had the first part occurred, the part following *fa-* would have also occurred. Sentences of this type can be divided into three groups, which are discussed and explained in the sections below.

⁷⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 17–18. For another occurrence of this example, see *ibid.*, 378, 3–4.

⁷¹ A verse in the *rajaz* meter, by Abū l-Najam al-'Ijlī. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 18–19. For the meaning of this verse and some of its words, see al-Baġdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 446–448 (verse 184). See also Lane, *Lexicon* V, 2175c, s.v. *'anaq*.

⁷² For this explanation see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 20–22. Cf. Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 200, 13–25. Sibawayhi subsequently discusses how to express sentences of this type with *'išrāk*. The particle *li-* (called *lām al-'amr* 'li- of the imperative') should introduce the verb following *fa-*, as in *i'tihi falyuḥadditka* 'come to him and let him converse with you!', in which both verbs denote a command, whereas the *naṣb* mood (*i'tihi fayuhadditaka*) would reflect the meaning of a conditional clause. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 21–376, 1. Cf. chapter 7, §3.1.4-a.

⁷³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 9–11; 376, 16–20 (cf. Reuschel, *al-Xalīl*, 26, 1–10, where Sibawayhi's explanation based on al-Xalīl's is discussed and clarified). For al-Zamaxšarī's and Ibn Ya'īš's similar explanations, see al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 112, 4–8; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 944, 17–18.

3.1.5.1. *Sentences introduced by ka'anna 'as if' followed by a negative utterance* Such sentences are very similar to sentences in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative (see §3.1.1), but they are introduced by *ka'anna* which transforms the negative sentence from real to hypothetical.⁷⁴

Sībawayhi's first example of a sentence of this type is *ka'annaka lam ta'tinā fatuḥadditānā* 'as if you did not come to us and [as a result] not converse with us'. The verb following *fa-* here can be *majzūm* due to *'iṣrāk*.⁷⁵ The sentence is then *ka'annaka lam ta'tinā fatuḥadditnā* 'as if you did not come to us and [as if you] did you not converse with us'. Another example with *naṣb* is the following line of poetry: *ka'annaka lam tadbaḥ li'ahlīka na'jatan / fayuṣbiḥa mulqan bil-falāti 'ihābuhā* 'as if you did not slaughter for your men a ewe and [as a result] its skin did not turn to be cast in the courtyard'.⁷⁶

3.1.5.2. *Hypothetical tamannī 'wish' sentences* Sībawayhi's first example is *wadda law ta'tīhi fatuḥadditahu* 'he wished that you would come to him and [then] you would converse with him'. Here, too, *'iṣrāk* is possible, in which case the speaker's intention in saying *wadda law ta'tīhi fatuḥaddituhu* is *wadda law ta'tīhi falaw tuḥaddituhu* 'he wished that you would come to him and [he wished] that you would converse with him'. Another example is a Qur'ānic verse which Sībawayhi records with the two possible moods, *naṣb* and *raf'*: *waddū law tudhinu fayudhinū/fayudhinūna* 'they wished that you would compromise, and [as a result/they wished that] they would [also] compromise' (Qur'ān 68:9).⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions an opinion that the meaning of a positive sentence introduced by *ka'anna* and followed by *fa-* and *naṣb* is equivalent to the meaning of a negative sentence and that *ka'anna* in such sentences does not denote *taṣbīḥ* 'comparison'. An example is *ka'annaka wālīn 'alaynā fataštumanā* which is equivalent to *lasta wālīyan 'alaynā fataštumanā* 'you are not our ruler and [as a result] you will not curse us'. See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 185, 11–13. According to al-Astarābādī, who mentions this opinion and the above-mentioned example, if the speaker's intention by *ka'anna* is to convey *taṣbīḥ* (and not negation), *naṣb* is not possible. See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 64, 17–19. Some later grammarians attribute this opinion to the Kūfans. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 132, 2–3; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 35, 4–6; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1674, 1–4. In Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XIII, 32a, 24–32b, 1, this opinion is attributed to al-Kisā'ī, a prominent representative of the Kūfans. Cf. §3.2.5.2.

⁷⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 2–3.

⁷⁶ A verse in the *tawīl* meter, by a member of the Banū Dārim tribe. See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 3–4. Cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 18, 4–7.

⁷⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 5–6. Cf. al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 112, 8–9; 151, 8–10; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* III, 240, 3–4; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 944, 18–23. See also Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 88, 7–8.

3.1.5.3. *Sentences introduced by a verb denoting doubt* In sentences of this type doubt is conveyed by doubly transitive verbs that belong to a category called the *'af'āl al-šakk wal-yaqīn* or the *'af'āl al-qulūb*.⁷⁸ Sībawayhi exemplifies this type with *ḥasibtuhu šatamanī fa'aṭiba 'alayhi* 'I thought that he had cursed me, and [had he indeed cursed me] I would have attacked him'.⁷⁹ Sībawayhi states that only if the speaker conceives of the action conveyed by the verb following *fa-* as hypothetical does this verb take *naṣb*. If, on the other hand, this action occurred in reality, the verb must take *raf'*. He explains the meaning of the hypothetical conditional clause with *naṣb* as *law šatamanī lawaṭibtu 'alayhi* 'had he cursed me, I would have attacked him'.⁸⁰

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Unlike Sībawayhi, whose discussion of the mood of the verb following *fā-* deals mainly with sentences in which the utterance preceding *fā-* is negative (see §3.1.1), al-Farrā' focuses on sentences in which the utterance preceding *fā-* is a prohibition (see §3.2.3). This difference very likely results from the fact that the first Qur'ānic verse on which al-Farrā' comments with respect to the mood of the verb following *fā-* is of this type: Qur'an 2:35.⁸¹

3.2.1. *The utterance preceding fā- is negative*

In his discussion of the sentence type in which the utterance preceding *fā-* is a prohibition, al-Farrā' says that *naṣb* also follows negative utterances, which are similar to those with a prohibition.⁸²

⁷⁸ This category is mentioned and explained in chapter 4, note 2.

⁷⁹ Jahn in his translation emphasizes the relationship of cause and effect between the two actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *fā-* and the fact that the latter is hypothetical: *Ich habe geglaubt, dass er mich geschmäht hat, wovon die Folge gewesen wäre, dass ich auf ihn losgesprungen wäre* (Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 155, 17–18). For additional similar translations, see Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 460, 18–21; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 747, 4 last lines; Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 487 (beginning of §302.i); Mosel, *Sibawayhi* I, 56, 9–16; Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 200, 3 last lines.

⁸⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 7–9. Cf. al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 88, note 27 of chapter 241; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 422, 1–7; al-Fārisi, *Ta'liq* II, 154, 12–13; al-Fārisi, *Manṭūra*, 145, 4–8 (*mas'ala* 153); al-Fārisi, *Iqfāl* I, 379, 1–2. See also Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 201, 7–17.

⁸¹ This is exactly the same case as in al-Axfaš's *Ma'ānī*, where the author's main discussion of *naṣb* following *fā-* is in his commentary on this verse. See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 222, 3–7.

⁸² See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 27, 5–6.

3.2.1.1. *Sentences in which a perfect verb is negated* Al-Farrā' briefly refers to this sentence type in his commentary on Qur'ān 6:52 and argues that only *naṣb* is possible following *fa-*. For details and reference see §3.2.1.2 and note 83 below.

3.2.1.2. *Sentences in which a nominal sentence with no verb is negated* Al-Farrā' mentions this sentence type in his commentary on Qur'ān 6:52, which consists of a negated nominal utterance with no verb preceding *fa-*: *wamā min ḥisābika 'alayhim min šay'in fataṭrudahum* 'nothing of your account falls upon them, that [as a result] you should drive them away'. According to al-Farrā' this is similar to an utterance in which a perfect verb is negated, because in both *naṣb* is compulsory; the explanation called by Sībawayhi *'iṣrāk* and by al-Farrā' *'itbā'* is not possible.⁸³ It is noteworthy that unlike Sībawayhi, who admits the possibility of *raf'* due to *inqiṭā'*, al-Farrā' does not mention this at all.

3.2.2. *The utterance preceding fa- is a question, wish or desire*

Similarly to the case of sentences in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is a prohibition (see §3.2.3 below), al-Farrā' characterizes the meaning of *naṣb* in this sentence type as equivalent to that of a conditional clause.⁸⁴

Here are al-Farrā's main ideas on two very similar Qur'ānic verses which consist of a question and belong to this sentence type:

a. *Man dā llaḍī yuqriḍu llāha qarḍan ḥasanan fayuḍā'ifuhu/fayuḍā'ifahu lahu 'aḍ'āfan kaṭīratan* 'who is he that will lend God a good loan, and (or: so that) [God] will multiply it for him manifold?' (Qur'ān 2:245). Al-Farrā' says that both *raf'* and *naṣb* are possible in the verb following *fa-*. The former is possible when this verb is taken as connected to the *marfū'* verb *yuqriḍu*, and the latter is possible as a *jawāb* to the question beginning with the interrogative particle *man*.⁸⁵

b. *Man dā llaḍī yuqriḍu llāha qarḍan ḥasanan fayuḍā'ifuhu/fayuḍā'ifahu lahu walahu 'ajrun karīmun* 'who is he that will lend God a good loan, and (or: so that) [God] will multiply it for him, and his shall be a generous wage?' (Qur'ān 57:11). As in the above-mentioned verse, al-Farrā' says that

⁸³ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 28, 2–5.

⁸⁴ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 229, 12–14.

⁸⁵ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 157, 2–4. See also *ibid.* III, 226, 2 last lines.

both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* are possible in the verb following *fa-*. For his arguments, see a. above.⁸⁶

Proceeding now to sentences consisting of a wish preceding *fa-*, al-Farrāʾ's commentary on Qurʾān 4:73 is a good example. This verse contains the word *layta* which denotes *tamannī*: *yā laytanī kuntu maʾahum faʾafūza fawzan* 'aẓīman' 'I wish that I had been with them and [then] I would have attained a mighty triumph'. Al-Farrāʾ compares this verse to the sentence type in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative: the wish expressed here concerns the past and it is therefore treated as a negated action which did not occur in reality. He says that the meaning of this verse is thus *lam ʾakun maʾahum faʾafūza* [*fawzan* 'aẓīman] 'I was not with them and [as a result] I did not attain [a mighty triumph]'.⁸⁷

Other examples which al-Farrāʾ considers to be of this type are two Qurʾānic verses in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is introduced by *laʾalla*. Al-Farrāʾ argues that in these examples the verb following *fa-* can be either *marfūʿ* or *manṣūb*. The former is explained as due to what al-Farrāʾ calls 'itbāʿ' (equivalent to Sibawayhi's 'iṣrāk'), in which the verbs preceding and following *fa-* are connected and have the same syntactic status. The *naṣb* is characterized as resulting from this verb being *jawāb laʾalla*, i.e. the utterance following *laʾalla*. The two verses are the following (both verses are related to the verses which precede them and these are therefore also quoted): *waqāla Firʾawnu yā Hāmānu bni lī ṣarḥan laʾallī ʾabluḡu l-ʾasbāba ʾasbāba l-samāwāti faʾaṭṭaliʾu/faʾaṭṭaliʾa ʾilā ʾilāhi Mūsā* 'Pharaoh said: O Haman, build for me a tower so that I may reach the cords, the cords of the heavens, and [so that/as a result] I may look upon Moses' God' (Qurʾān 40:36–37);⁸⁸ *wamā yudrīka laʾallahu yazzakkā ʾaw yaddakkaru fatanfaʾuhu/fatanfaʾahu l-dīkrā* 'and what makes you know? Perhaps he would cleanse himself, or yet remember, and [perhaps/as a result] the reminder would profit him' (Qurʾān 80:3–4).⁸⁹ See §3.3.5 below for the grammarians' dispute on the mood of the verb following *fa-* when the preceding utterance is introduced by *laʾalla*.

⁸⁶ See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* III, 132, 9–10.

⁸⁷ See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* I, 276, 8–12.

⁸⁸ For the discussion of this verse see al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* III, 9, 5–9. Cf. al-Zajjāj, *Maʾānī* (1994) IV, 375, 6; al-Naḥḥās, *ʾIrāb* IV, 33, 7–3.

⁸⁹ For his discussion of this verse see al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* III, 235, 5 last lines, where he states that most readers choose *rafʿ*, but *naṣb* is also possible as *jawāb laʾalla*. Cf. al-Zajjāj, *Maʾānī* (1994) V, 283, 5–4; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* II, 494, 7–9.

3.2.3. *The utterance preceding fa- is a prohibition*

Al-Farrā'’s first example of this sentence type also introduces his main discussion of *naṣb* following *fa-*. This is Qurʾān 2:35, in which the verb following *fa-* can be taken as *manṣūb* (due to the meaning of *jawāb*) or *majzūm* (due to *ʾiṣrāk*): *walā taqrabā hādihi l-šajarata fatakinā mina l-ḏālīmīna* ‘do not draw near this tree lest you (or: and do not) be of the evildoers!’.⁹⁰

Al-Farrā' considers the meaning of *naṣb* in this sentence type as equivalent to that of a conditional clause: *wamaʾnā l-jawābi wal-naṣbi lā tafʾal hādā fayufʾala bika mujāzātan* ‘the meaning of *jawāb* and *naṣb* is ‘do not do that lest it be done to you!’ with the meaning of a condition’.⁹¹

Additional examples of this sentence type are Qurʾān 20:81, 20:61 and 4:129 (the second is recorded by Sibawayhi, too; for a translation see §3.1.3).⁹² He subsequently refers to Qurʾān 6:52, with a more complex structure consisting of two utterances introduced by *fa-* followed by *naṣb*: the first is a *jawāb* to a negative nominal utterance and the second is a *jawāb* to a prohibition (the first is also quoted by Sibawayhi and discussed in §3.2.1.2).⁹³

3.2.4 *The utterance preceding fa- is a command*

According to al-Farrā'’s one syntactic analysis of Qurʾān 10:88, this verse forms an example of this sentence type.⁹⁴ This verse consists of an imperative verb followed by *fa-* and *naṣb*: *rabbanā ṭmis ʾalā ʾamwālihim waṣdud ʾalā qulūbihim falā yuʾminū ḥattā yarawu l-ʾaḏāba l-ʾalīma* ‘our Lord, obliterate their possessions and harden their hearts lest they believe, until they see the painful punishment!’. Al-Farrā' suggests two ways to explain why the verb following *fa-* is in the *naṣb* mood: either because it is the *jawāb* to the imperative verb (*iṭmis*, or because it is a *duʾā* ‘invocation’, as if the clause began with *al-lahumma falā yuʾminū* ‘God, may they not believe!’.⁹⁵ According to the former explanation this verse is an example of the sentence type discussed here. In order to exemplify it further, al-Farrā' quotes a line of poetry which Sibawayhi also quotes in a similar context: *yā nāqa*

⁹⁰ See al-Farrā', *Maʾānī* I, 26, 12–13.

⁹¹ See al-Farrā', *Maʾānī* I, 27, 2.

⁹² For al-Farrā'’s references to these verses see al-Farrā', *Maʾānī* I, 27, 4–5.

⁹³ For al-Farrā'’s discussion of this verse see al-Farrā', *Maʾānī* I, 27, 13–28, 6. Cf. al-Axfaš, *Maʾānī* (1985) II, 489, –6–3; al-Zajjāj, *Maʾānī* (1994) II, 5–6; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* (1996) II, 186, 11–16; al-Naḥḥās, *ʾIṭrāb* II, 68, 10–11.

⁹⁴ For the whole discussion see al-Farrā', *Maʾānī* I, 477, 15–478, 4.

⁹⁵ The explanation of *duʾā* is attributed to al-Kisāʾī. See al-Naḥḥās, *ʾIṭrāb* II, 266, –2; al-Kisāʾī, *Maʾānī*, 160, 3. Al-Axfaš seems to offer both of the two above-mentioned explanations. See al-Axfaš, *Maʾānī* (1985) II, 573, 4–5.

sīrī ‘*anaqan fasīḥā / ‘ilā Sulaymāna fanastariḥā* (for a translation see the beginning of §3.1.4).

In his commentary on Qur’ān 14:44, which also consists of an imperative verb followed by an utterance introduced by *fa-*, al-Farrā’ mentions an interesting view with respect to this sentence type. He says that both *naṣb* and *rafʿ* are possible following *fa-* when the preceding utterance consists of an imperative verb. The former is explained as *jawāb*, and the latter as due to *isti’nāf*, i.e. when *fa-* is taken as beginning a new utterance, unconnected to the preceding one. Al-Farrā’ states that the explanation of *isti’nāf* in this sentence type is adequate, and adds that al-‘Alā’ b. Siyāba, who taught Mu‘āḍ al-Harrā’ and his colleagues, contends that he does not put the verb following *fa-* in *naṣb* when it is the *jawāb* to an imperative verb.⁹⁶

3.2.5. *The utterance preceding fa- is a hypothetical clause; only if it had occurred would the utterance following fa- also have occurred*

Al-Farrā’ refers to sentences in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is a hypothetical conditional sentence and to those introduced by *ka’anna*. Examples of this sentence type are discussed in the two sections below.

3.2.5.1. *Hypothetical conditional sentences* According to one of al-Farrā’’s syntactic analyses of Qur’ān 39:58, this verse is an example of such a sentence.⁹⁷ This verse consists of *law* expressing a hypothetical wish followed by *fa-* and *naṣb*: *law ‘anna lī karratan fa’akūna minā l-muḥsinīna* ‘if I could only return again, that I would be among the righteous’. Al-Farrā’ suggests two ways to explain the *naṣb* following *fa-*: the first is to regard it as introducing the *jawāb* to *law*, and the second is to posit here an ‘*atf*’ of two *manṣūb* verbs, as if the sentence were *law ‘anna lī ‘an ‘akurra fa’akūna* (see appendix A, §2.2 for al-Farrā’’s reference to the concept of ‘*atf*’).⁹⁸

3.2.5.2. *Sentences introduced by ka’anna* Unlike Sibawayhi who treats negative sentences introduced by *ka’anna* (see §3.1.5.1), al-Farrā’ discusses

⁹⁶ See al-Farrā’, *Ma‘ānī* II, 79, 1–5. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *Ṭrāb* II, 372, 1–6, where the author says that some grammarians unjustly contend that the verb following *fa-* should not be *manṣūb* when the preceding utterance consists of an imperative verb; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1669, 5–8, where the author mentions the above-mentioned opinion of al-‘Alā’ b. Siyāba and characterizes it as exceptional. See also Ibn ‘Aqil, *Musā’id* III, 85, 1–2.

⁹⁷ For the whole discussion see al-Farrā’, *Ma‘ānī* II, 422, 8–12.

⁹⁸ Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *Ṭrāb* IV, 18, –6–3, where the two explanations are provided. Other grammarians mention only the first. See, for example, al-Axfaṣ, *Ma‘ānī* (1985) I, 230, 11–231, 6; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 345, 8ff.; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 474, 2–4.

positive sentences introduced by *ka'annamā* which may be followed by *fa-* and *naṣb*. This he does in his commentary on a verse with such a structure in which the verb following *fa-* is *marfū'*:⁹⁹ *waman yušrik billāhi faka'annamā xarra mina l-samā'i fataxtafuhu l-ṭayru 'aw tahwī bihi l-rīḥu fi makānin saḥiqin* 'whoever associates with God anything, it is as though he has fallen from heaven and the birds snatch him away, or the wind sweeps him headlong into a place far away' (Qur'ān 22:31). Al-Farrā' explains that the verb *taxtafuhu* following *fa-* takes *raf'* because it is attached to the verb *xarra*, although these two are not of the same form; the former is in the imperfect and the latter in the perfect form. Al-Farrā' states that *naṣb* is possible in similar sentences, and adds that this mood is the regular way of speech. *Naṣb* in this case can be explained in two ways: either by taking *ka'annamā* to mean *yuxayyalu 'ilayya 'an* 'it seems to me that' or *'azunnu 'an* 'I think that', so that this mood is actually induced by *'an*; or by considering the utterance introduced by *ka'anna* as negative, so that the utterance introduced by *fa-* is the *jawāb* to a negative utterance. Al-Farrā' exemplifies the latter with the sentence *ka'annaka 'arabiyyun fatukrama*¹⁰⁰ 'as if you are a Bedouin and [as a result] you will be honored', in which the *naṣb* mood is explained as due to the speaker's intended meaning of *lasta bi'arabiyyin fatukrama* 'you are not a Bedouin and [as a result] you will not be honored'. Cf. note 74.

3.3. Other grammarians

Unlike Sibawayhi, who discusses in detail every sentence type in which *fa-* may be followed by a *manṣūb* verb, most subsequent grammarians tend to ignore the finer distinctions between the types. They usually repeat the sentence types to which Sibawayhi refers, but the list may differ from one grammarian to another, as seen in the sections below. Here are the names which grammarians use in order to describe the sentence types: *nafy* 'negation', *istifhām* 'question', *tamannī* 'wish', *nahy* 'prohibition', *'amr* 'command', *'ard* 'light urging', *du'ā* 'invocation', *taḥḍīd* 'intensive urging', *tarajjī* 'request (using *la'alla*)'. Later grammarians, from the time of Ibn Mālik on, refer to *nafy* and *ṭalab*, the latter (literally meaning 'request') encompassing all sentence types mentioned above except for *nafy*.

⁹⁹ For the whole discussion see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 225, 1–5.

¹⁰⁰ This verb can be read in the passive or the active voice, viz. *tukrama* or *tukrima*. I prefer the former because no direct object follows and because the meaning seems more suitable.

It is noteworthy that many grammarians follow Sibawayhi and al-Farrā' in attributing the meaning of a conditional clause to the utterance in which *fa-* is followed by *naṣb*.¹⁰¹ Ibn Sīda, for example, says that the meaning of *naṣb* following *fa-* is that the action conveyed by the verb in this mood is bound to happen following that of the verb preceding *fa-*.¹⁰² Al-Ḥarīrī explains that such sentences have a trace of a conditional clause (*lamḥan mina l-ṣartī wal-jazā'i*), the utterance preceding *fa-* occupying the position of protasis and the following utterance that of apodosis. As an example he notes that the meaning of *lā taqum fa'ağḍaba 'alayka* 'do not stand lest I be angry at you' is equivalent to 'in taqum 'ağḍab 'alayka 'if you rise, I will be angry at you'. He adds that this is also the meaning of *naṣb* following *fa-* in other sentence types.¹⁰³

3.3.1. *Grammarians who refer to some or all of the following sentence types: nafy, istifhām, tamannī, nahy, 'amr, 'arḍ, du'ā, taḥḍīḍ, tarajjī*

Al-Axfaš and Ibn al-Sarrāj enumerate five sentence types, which are equivalent to those mentioned by Sibawayhi: *nafy, istifhām, tamannī, nahy* and 'amr'.¹⁰⁴ Al-Naḥḥās states that according to the Baṣrans these are the five sentence types in which *fa-* can be followed by *naṣb*, to which the Kūfans add *du'ā*.¹⁰⁵

In his *Jumal* al-Zajjājī adds 'arḍ to the five above-mentioned sentence types, but provides examples only for the original five.¹⁰⁶ Al-Fārisī and many other grammarians also mention the six sentence types. Al-Fārisī and Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī say that their main characteristic is that they are all not *wājib*, i.e. they are not indicative sentences denoting certainty.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰¹ See, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Ma'ānī* (1994) I, 114, 14–20; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 15, 4–8; 18, 9; 20, 11–12; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 182, 9–10; 182, 14–183, 11; al-Fārisī, *Idāh* II, 1068, 5–8 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1069, 4–7; al-Fārisī, *Iḡfāl* I, 368, 3–369, 5; al-Warrāq, *Ilal*, 275, 8–10; al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 3 last lines; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 154, 16ff.; al-Baṭalyawsi, *'Iṣlāḥ*, 254, 7–255, 11 (for details see §2.3.1-a, towards the end); Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 209, 4–to end; al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 81, 7–11; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 183, 7–8; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 69, 19–24.

¹⁰² See Ibn Sīda, *Muxaṣṣaṣ* XIV, 48, 5–2.

¹⁰³ See al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 312, 1–313, 4.

¹⁰⁴ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 221, 2–222, 1; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) III, 471, 7–9. Al-Axfaš adds what he calls *juḥūd*, which means 'negation', like the above-mentioned *nafy*. Since al-Axfaš does not exemplify *juḥūd* it is not clear what distinguished it from *nafy*; perhaps *juḥūd* involves the hypothetical sentences to which Sibawayhi refers (see §3.1.5).

¹⁰⁵ See al-Naḥḥās, *'Iṣlāḥ* V, 149, 11–13.

¹⁰⁶ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 196, 10–197, 4. Cf. his commentators al-Baṭalyawsi, *'Iṣlāḥ*, 254, 3 last lines; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 267–268.

¹⁰⁷ See al-Fārisī, *Idāh* II, 1060, 2–1061, 1 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1062, 1–1064, 15 (cf. al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 10–16); al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 110–111;

Ibn Jinnī mentions the six above-mentioned sentence types, to which he adds *du‘ā*.¹⁰⁸ Al-Ḍarīr also enumerates these seven types and adds that *‘amr* and *du‘ā* have the same form, but since the latter expresses a request from God a term other than *‘amr* is used.¹⁰⁹

Al-‘Ukbarī, Ibn Mu‘tī and other grammarians mention a total of eight types: the seven mentioned above and also *taḥḍīd*.¹¹⁰

Al-Astarābādī is one of the grammarians who enumerate all the nine sentence types that appear in the title of this section.¹¹¹ In his commentary on Ibn al-Ḥājjib, who mentions only six types (*nafy*, *istifhām*, *tamannī*, *nahy*, *‘amr*, *‘arḍ*; see the reference towards the end of note 107), al-Astarābādī adds *du‘ā*, *taḥḍīd* and *tarajjī*. In reference to *du‘ā* he distinguishes between verbs in the imperative form, as in *al-lahumma rzuqnī mālan fa’aṣṣaddaqa minhu* ‘my God, grant me with money, and [then] I will dole from it’, and those in the perfect form, as in *ḡafara llāhu laka fayudxilaka l-jannata* ‘may God forgive you, and [then] he will let you in paradise’. He states that al-Kisā’ī and al-Farrā’ allowed *naṣb* in the latter.

3.3.2. Grammarians who refer to two sentence types only: *nafy* and *ṭalab*

Ibn Mālik and later grammarians mention only two sentence types in which *naṣb* can follow *fa*:- *nafy* and *ṭalab*. Ibn Mālik states that *naṣb* is possible only when these types are *maḥḍayni* ‘pure’, by which he means that *naṣb* is not possible following utterances which are negative in form but positive in meaning, as in *mā ta’tinā ‘illā fatuḥadditunā* ‘you do not come to us unless when you converse with us’, or following forms of *‘asmā’ al-fi’l* which denote command but are not considered verbal forms (see §4.3.1.1 and §4.3.3, respectively). Grammarians who refer to *nafy* and *ṭalab* explain that the latter consists of all sentence types which denote a

al-Rummānī, *Ma‘ānī*, 43, 2 last lines; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 576, 14–17; Ibn Burhān al-‘Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 353, 11ff.; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 109, –1–110, 2; al-Zamaxšarī, *Muqaddima*, 288, 5–6; Ibn al-Anbārī, *‘Inṣāf*, 230, 14–16; 230, 19–231, 4; al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 81, 7–11; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Kāfiya* (1998) IV, 63, 3–4; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XV, 464a, 14ff.; al-Kaffawī, *Kulliyāt*, 678b, –7–679a, 8.

¹⁰⁸ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 270, –5–272, 1; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma’*, 52, 1–11.

¹⁰⁹ See al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 167, 12–18.

¹¹⁰ See al-‘Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 37, 2 last lines; Ibn Mu‘tī, *Fuṣūl*, 204, 10–13; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 361, 2ff.; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 163, 10–17; Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 263, 9–10; Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, *Ḍarā’ir*, 284, 6–7; Abū Ḥayyān, *Taqrīb*, 81, 13–15.

¹¹¹ For the whole discussion see al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 63, 6–14. Cf. Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 231, 5–11, where the author enumerates these nine types as well. (In other places Ibn Mālik narrows the discussion to two types only: *nafy* and *ṭalab*; see §3.3.2 below.)

request, i.e. *istifhām*, *tamannī*, *nahy*, 'amr', 'arḍ, du'ā' and *taḥḍīd*, which are mentioned and discussed in the previous section.¹¹²

3.3.3. *The difference between tamannī and 'arḍ*

A number of grammarians discuss the differences between the similar sentence types *tamannī* and 'arḍ. Al-Jurjānī explains that *tamannī* conveys a wish or a desire, whereas 'arḍ conveys the idea of urging someone to do something. He exemplifies the former with *laytahu 'indanā fayuhadditanā* (an example already used by Sībawayhi; see §3.1.2.2) and the latter by 'alā *tanzilu fatuṣiba xayran* 'why don't you camp, and [then] you will find good?'. He concludes with the comment that *tamannī* conveys no urging.¹¹³

3.3.4. *The difference between 'arḍ and taḥḍīd*

Both of these types convey urging someone to do something, but they differ in intensity. Ibn Fāris states that *al-'arḍu 'arfaqu wal-taḥḍīdu 'a'zamu* 'arḍ is gentler and *taḥḍīd* is more intense'. Therefore, he concludes, the latter is closer to the imperative form.¹¹⁴ Ibn 'Uṣfūr explains that 'arḍ does not convey *ṭalab* but urging. He exemplifies this with 'alā *tanzilu 'indanā fanatahaddata* 'why don't you camp by us, and [then] we will converse?' which he explains as meaning 'āṭir *fi'la hādā 'in ra'ayta fi'lahu* 'prefer to do this action, if you think of doing it'. *Taḥḍīd*, on the other hand, is closer to the imperative because it conveys *ṭalab*, and therefore means *if'alhu* 'do it!'.¹¹⁵

3.3.5. *The dispute on the mood following tarajjī introduced by la'alla*

The grammarians disagree on whether the verb following *fa-* may take *naṣb* if the preceding utterance is introduced by *la'alla*. Sībawayhi does not refer at all to such sentences, whereas al-Farrā' refers to two verses

¹¹² See Ibn Mālik, 'Alfiyya, 161, 9 (Arabic text) and 160–162 (the editor's remarks); Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 106, 10; 122, 3–6; 124, 5–8; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashil* II.2, 28, 2–4; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 482, 6–8; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 321, 1–324, 1; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 272, 4–5; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 295, –2–296, 3; al-Makkūdī, *Šarḥ* II, 696, 3–697, 10; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 208, 2–212, 2; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ al-'alfiyya*, 150, –4–151, 6.

¹¹³ See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1064, 8–12.

¹¹⁴ See Ibn Fāris, *Šāhibī*, 187, –7–188, 4. Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Trāb*, 133, 3–4 (and al-Azharī's commentary in al-Azharī, *Muwaṣṣil*, 114, 3 last lines); Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 278, 1–3. For modern scholars' explanations of the two sentence types and the difference between them, see Lane, *Lexicon* VI, 2322c, –11–10; 2322c, –5–4; Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 369, 4; 369, 10. Cf. Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 206, –5, where the author translates these two terms as 'request' and 'urging', respectively.

¹¹⁵ See Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 151, 8–11.

in which the utterance preceding *fa-* begins with *la'alla* and the verb following *fa-* is *manšūb* and compares them to sentence types in which the utterance preceding *fa-* consists of a question or a wish (see §3.2.2 towards the end). Here are some opinions on this sentence type.

Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions the view that when *la'alla* conveys a question or doubt, the verb following *fa-* may take *našb*. But he adds that *'aṣḥābunā lā ya'rīfūna l-istifhāma bila'alla* 'our friends (i.e. those who share our *maḏhab*) do not know the [alleged meaning of] question of *la'alla*'.¹¹⁶

Al-Naḥḥās presents a similar opinion in his commentary on Qur'an 80:4 (the verse is quoted and translated at the end of §3.2.2). He says that the Baṣrans reject the possibility of putting the verb following *fa-* in *našb* when the utterance preceding it is introduced by *la'alla*, as do the Kūfans, too, although al-Farrā', followed by some Kūfans, explains the *našb* mood in the above-mentioned verse as *jawāb* to *la'alla*.¹¹⁷

Al-Ḥarīrī devotes a short section in his *Durra* to a discussion of the difference between *tarajjī* and *tamannī*.¹¹⁸ The former, conveyed by *la'alla*, denotes a possible occurrence, whereas the latter, conveyed by *layta*, is more general and can denote both possible and impossible occurrences. He exemplifies this difference with the sentence *layta l-ṣabāba ya'ūdu* 'I wish that youth would return!', an impossible wish using *layta*. In this sentence one cannot use *la'alla* instead of *layta*; the sentence **la'alla l-ṣabāba ya'ūdu* 'perhaps youth would return' is ungrammatical. Al-Ḥarīrī then explains that because of this difference between *tarajjī* and *tamannī*, the Baṣrans distinguish between them with respect to *našb* following *fa-*. In sentences introduced by *layta*, such as Qur'an 4:73, they allow *našb* following *fa-*, whereas in sentences introduced by *la'alla*, such as Qur'an 40:37, they consider *našb* weak and prefer *raf'* (both verses are quoted and translated in §3.2.2). Although al-Ḥarīrī does not explicitly say so, he means that according to the Baṣrans *našb* is possible only following *tamannī*, which conveys more doubt. *Tarajjī*, on the other hand, since it conveys a possible occurrence, is conceived by these grammarians as closer to an utterance denoting certainty, after which *našb* following *fa-* is not possible (see §4). In his *Šarḥ mulḥat al-ʿirāb* al-Ḥarīrī briefly repeats the difference between these two sentence types and exemplifies it with a

¹¹⁶ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 185, 2–4. Cf. Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 153, 14–16.

¹¹⁷ See al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* V, 149, 8–150, 5. Cf. Abū Hayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1673, 6 last lines, where the author accepts the possibility of *našb* following *fa-* when the preceding utterance is introduced by *la'alla*, due to evidence of such sentences in poetry and prose like the above-mentioned Qur'ānic verse; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 123, 13–124, 3.

¹¹⁸ See al-Ḥarīrī, *Durra*, 193, 8–16.

line of poetry which contains the above-mentioned utterance with *layta*: 'alā layta l-šabāba ya'ūdu yawman / fa'uxbirahu bimā fa'ala l-mašību 'I wish that youth would return one day, and [then] I would inform him of what getting old did'.¹¹⁹ Al-Ḥarīrī explains that since the utterance preceding *fa-* denotes *tamannī* (here: a hypothetical wish), the verb following *fa-* is *manšūb*.¹²⁰

3.4. Secondary sources

Many modern scholars mention and discuss the sentence types in which *fa-* can be followed by a *manšūb* verb. Studies in Latin from the 18th and 19th centuries already state that *našb* may follow *fa-* only when the preceding utterance consists of negation, question, wish, prohibition or command (these are the first five types mentioned in §3.3.1).¹²¹

De Sacy discusses this topic at length.¹²² He says that when *fa-* is followed by *našb* it introduces the result or effect of whatever is conveyed by the utterance preceding it, and means *afin que, pour que* 'in order that'; *de sorte que* 'so that'; or *de peur que* 'lest'. He emphasizes that all instances of *fa-* followed by *našb* denote the idea of an action in the future whose occurrence is contingent (*subordonnée*) on an action which depends on desire.

Fleischer criticizes the last part of de Sacy's above-mentioned statement and argues that it reflects an improper narrowing of the idea that a *manšūb* verb following *fa-* can convey; such a verb, so he claims, may denote not only results or effects of conscious and intended actions, but also those of physical, unconscious or instinctive actions, as in *mā 'amṭarati l-samā'u fatunbita l-'arḍu* 'sky did not give rain and [as a result] land did not germinate'.¹²³

The French scholar Fleisch also discusses at length the sentence types in which *fa-* can be followed by *našb*, although he provides only a few examples. He correctly explains that the utterance introduced by *fa-* and

¹¹⁹ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by Abū l-'Atāhiyya.

¹²⁰ See al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 210, -4-211, 1. Cf. al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* II, 226, 23-26.

¹²¹ See Lucius, *Grammatica*, 68, 2-9; Erpenius, *Grammar*, 62, 4-13; Kosegarten, *Grammatica*, 595, §1273; Ewald, *Grammar*, 117-118 (part of §628). Cf. Trumpp, *Einleitung*, 38, -1-39, 7; Cheikho-Durand, *Elementa*, 136, note a.; Wright, *Grammar* II, 30, 6 last lines.

For a comprehensive reference of all sentence types in which the verb following *fa-* may take *našb*, including the disagreement among grammarians on the *tarajjī* type (discussed in §3.3.5), see Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 354-358; 365-371. See also Ya'qūb, *Ḥurūf*, 310-313; Ya'qūb, *Daqā'iq*, 285-286.

¹²² See de Sacy, *Grammaire* II, 25-27, §56.

¹²³ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 534-535.

naṣb denotes the result of the action conveyed in the preceding utterance, *if this action indeed occurs* (emphasis in original). It is therefore inferred that if the utterance preceding *fa-* denotes a certain action, *naṣb* following *fa-* is not expected.¹²⁴

Finally, Ba'albakī's article on *fa-* should be mentioned for its significant contribution to the understanding of the topic discussed in this section, especially of Sībawayhi's views. Ba'albakī discusses most of Sībawayhi's example sentences in chapter 241 of his *Kitāb* and divides them into groups according to type.¹²⁵ His division is similar to my division discussed above in §3.1. He subsequently compares Sībawayhi's analysis of *bāb al-fā'* to that of later grammarians,¹²⁶ and rightfully states that it is remarkable how close the *ṣawāhid* (both Qur'ānic and of poetry) are to Sībawayhi's sentence types, and how different his attitude to this topic is in comparison with other grammarians, both in his presentation of the theoretical base and in his explanations of this theory. Ba'albakī shows how later grammarians (even those who were active not long after Sībawayhi, like al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj) tend to treat this subject rather technically, in that they enumerate and discuss only some of Sībawayhi's sentence types and corresponding examples without a thorough treatment of their common theoretical base.

4. SENTENCE TYPES IN WHICH A *MANṢŪB* VERB CANNOT FOLLOW *FA-*

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

Following his discussion of cases in which *naṣb* is permissible after *fa-* (see §3.1), Sībawayhi discusses sentence types in which this is not possible, namely when the utterance preceding *fa-* is *wājib*, in which case the verb following *fa-* can only take *raf'*. He exemplifies this with *'innahu 'indanā fayuhadditunā* 'He is with us and converses with us' and *sawfa 'ātihi fa'uḥaddituhu* 'I will come to him and converse with him'. In these examples only *raf'* is possible, due to *'iṣrāk* or *inqitā'*.¹²⁷ He subsequently quotes two Qur'ānic examples in which only *raf'* is possible:¹²⁸ Qur'an 2:102 and the utterance *kun fayakūnu* 'be! And it is' which occurs eight

¹²⁴ See Fleisch, *Arabe*, 220–221, §C, first part.

¹²⁵ See Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 197, towards the end–201.

¹²⁶ See Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 202ff.

¹²⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 2–5.

¹²⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 5–8.

times in the Qur'ān.¹²⁹ In Qur'ān 2:102 the utterance preceding *fa-* is a prohibition, but the verb following *fa-* takes *rafʿ* because it is not dependent on it but rather attached to the preceding affirmative verb *kafarū* (thus the *rafʿ* mood is due to *ʾiṣrāk*).¹³⁰ In *kun fayakūnu* the utterance preceding *fa-* consists of command, but *yakūnu* is taken as introducing a new sentence (thus here the mood is due to *inqiṭāʾ*).¹³¹

Sibawayhi subsequently argues that *naṣb* following an utterance which is *wājib* is only possible as poetic license. In these exceptional instances *naṣb* should be explained as due to an *ʾan muḍmara* (this is Sibawayhi's explanation of regular occurrences of *naṣb* following *fa-*; see §7.1).¹³² As examples he provides three lines of poetry: *saʾatruku manzilī libanī Tamīmīn / waʾalḥaqu bil-Ḥijāzi faʾastariḥā* 'I will leave my home to the Banū Tamīm and join [the tribe] in Ḥijāz, and [then] I will find rest';¹³³ *ṭummata lā tajzūnanī ʾinda dākumu / walākin sayajzīnī l-ʾilāhu fayūʿqibā* 'subsequently you will not reward me in this, but God will reward me, and [then] he will give [a requital]';¹³⁴ *lanā haḍbatun lā yanzilu l-ḍullu waṣṭahā / wayaʾwī ʾilayhā l-mustajīru fayūṣamā* 'we have a summit in which humiliation does not reside, and the one seeking protection aims at it and [then] he is protected'.¹³⁵ Sibawayhi remarks on the second verse that this structure is not adequate in speech (this also applies to the two

¹²⁹ Qur'ān 2:117, 3:47, 3:59, 6:73, 16:40, 19:35, 36:82, 40:68. In all these verses the utterance *kun fayakūnu* follows a verbal form of *qāla* 'to say' and the context is creation, which happens when God says 'be!', as in Qur'ān 2:117 *waʾidā qadā ʾamran faʾinnamā yaqūlu lahu kun fayakūnu* 'and when [God] decrees a thing, he but says to it 'be!' and it is'.

¹³⁰ This is how al-Fārisī interprets Sibawayhi's words here. See al-Fārisī, *Taʾliqa* II, 155, 4–7; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 145, 9–146, 2 (part of *masʾala* 154). Another possibility is that the verb following *fa-* introduces a new sentence (*rafʿ* is thus explained as due to *inqiṭāʾ*). For grammarians who explain Sibawayhi's view in this way, see, for example, al-Sirāfi quoted in al-Fārisī, *Taʾliqa* II, 155, beginning of note 6; al-Zajjāj, *ʾIrāb* I, 176, 10–12. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Taʾliqa* II, 155, 7–9, where the author presents it not as Sibawayhi's but as an additional, possible explanation.

¹³¹ Cf. al-Zajjāj, *ʾIrāb* I, 176, 13–14; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 423. Cf. note 129 above.

¹³² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 8–9. Al-Fārisī, unlike Sibawayhi, attempts to justify this exceptional phenomenon which is due to poetic license, but his explanation is far from convincing. See al-Fārisī, *Taʾliqa* II, 156, 5–157, 2; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 146, 6 last lines (*masʾala* 155).

¹³³ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by al-Muḡira l-Ḥanzalī l-Tamīmī (Sibawayhi does not mention the author of this verse by name; the identification is according to Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 54a, 8). See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 9–11. Cf. *ibid.*, 398, 20–22, where Sibawayhi quotes this verse again and argues that *naṣb* is *daʿif* 'weak' (in regular speech, but allowed in poetry).

¹³⁴ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by al-Aʾšā. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 12–14.

¹³⁵ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by ʿArafa. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 14–15.

others), for a statement that is consistent with his opinion that only poetic license enables it.

Sībawayhi then discusses the difference between *wājib* and *naḡy*¹³⁶ with respect to the mood of the verb following *fa-*.¹³⁷ He argues that the meanings of *naḡb* following *fa-* are not possible when the preceding utterance is *wājib* but only when it is *naḡy* (or any other non-*wājib* type).¹³⁸ He provides two example sentences, each of which represents one of the two possible meanings of the latter sentence type.¹³⁹

Sībawayhi begins with the second meaning explained in §3.1.1.2-b, as reflected in *mā 'ataytanī qaṭṭu fatuḡhadditanī 'illā bil-ṡarri* 'you never came to me unless when you conversed with me maliciously'. In such a sentence the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative, and so *naḡb* following *fa-* can be used to deny the negation of the main verb. In other words, this sentence, in which the verb *'ataytanī* is negated by *mā*, implies that the action denoted by *tuḡhadditanī* is indeed negated while that of *'ataytanī* is not; the speaker's intention is that the action denoted by the verb preceding *fa-* did take place, but was never accompanied by that of the following *manṡūb* verb.¹³⁹

As an example of the other possible meaning of this sentence type, Sībawayhi uses the sentence *mā ta'tinī fatuḡhadditanī*, meaning *mā ta'tinī fakayfa tuḡhadditanī* (see §3.1.1.2-a). He explains that the action denoted by the verb following *fa-* is not negated and that the speaker's intention is that it does or at least may take place in reality,¹⁴⁰ but what prevents it from happening is the non-occurrence of the action of the verb preceding *fa-*.

Sībawayhi subsequently emphasizes that when the utterance preceding *fa-* is *wājib*, the verb following *fa-* cannot be *manṡūb*, because the utterance it introduces is also *wājib*. It is therefore unnecessary to have an *'an muḡmara*.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ Although Sībawayhi here contrasts *wājib* and *naḡy*, it seems to me that the latter stands for all utterances that are not *wājib*, that is, not only negation but also question, wish, etc. (see §3.1).

¹³⁷ For his discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 377, 20–378, 3.

¹³⁸ Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 157, –12ff.

¹³⁹ Cf. al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 157, 6–158, 7.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 89, note 38 of chapter 241.

¹⁴¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 4–6.

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

To judge by al-Farrā's example sentences in which *naṣb* is possible following *fa-*, it would seem that he shares Sibawayhi's view: *naṣb* is not possible when the utterance preceding *fa-* is *wājib*. Clear evidence for this is his commentary on 'alam tara 'anna llāha 'anzala mina l-samā'i mā'an fatuṣbiḥu l-'arḍu muxḍarratan 'have you not seen that God has sent down out of heaven water, and in the morning the earth becomes green?' (Qur'ān 22:63).¹⁴² In this verse the verb following *fa-* takes *raf'*, although the preceding utterance is a question. Al-Farrā' explains the mood of this verb as follows: *rafa'ta fatuṣbiḥu li'anna l-ma'nā fi 'alam tara ma'nāhu xabarun* 'you put the verb *tuṣbiḥu* following *fa-* in *raf'* because 'alam tara has a meaning of *xabar*, i.e. a declarative sentence'. He subsequently clarifies that 'alam tara means here *i'lam* 'know'.

It is noteworthy that al-Farrā', unlike Sibawayhi, does not discuss exceptional examples from poetry in which the verb following *fa-* is *manṣūb* despite the fact that the preceding utterance is *wājib*.

4.3. *Other grammarians*4.3.1. *The utterance preceding fa- denotes certainty*

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi and al-Farrā' that when the utterance preceding *fa-* denotes certainty, the verb following *fa-* is not *manṣūb*. Like Sibawayhi, some explain that only when the utterance preceding *fa-* is *ḡayr wājib* can the following verb take *naṣb*, because then the two utterances are in contrast; when the preceding utterance is *wājib*, on the other hand, what follows *fa-* is also *wājib*, and has the same syntactic function in the sentence.¹⁴³ They emphasize, like Sibawayhi, that when *naṣb* follows *wājib* in poetry, it is due to poetic license. Most quote Sibawayhi's first and the third lines of poetry (see §4.1). On the first al-Axfaš remarks *wahāḍā lā yakādu yu'rafu wahuwa fi l-šī'ri jā'izun* 'this [structure in which the verb following *fa-* is *manṣūb* although the preceding utterance is *wājib*] is almost unknown [in speech], but is possible in poetry'.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 229, 11–230, 1. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* III, 105, 5–6.

¹⁴³ See, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 155, 10–11; 182, 4–12; al-Fārisī, *ʿĪdāḥ* II, 1068, 5–8 (cf. his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1068, 10–1069, 4).

¹⁴⁴ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 231, 6–232, 4. Cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 23, 9–24, 5; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) III, 471, 9–472, 5; al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) II, 232–235.

4.3.1.1. *The utterance preceding fa- is negative but conveys a positive meaning* When the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative in form but positive in meaning, the verb following *fa-* cannot be *naṣb*. Ibn al-Sarrāj exemplifies this with *mā zāla* and *lam yazal* which have a positive meaning and therefore cannot be followed by *naṣb* as in the ungrammatical example **mā zāla Zaydun qā'imān fa'uṭṭiyaka* 'Zayd is still standing and [as a result] I will give you [something]'.¹⁴⁵

According to al-Fārisī, al-Astarābādī and other grammarians, when a negation is followed by an exception, as in *mā qāma 'illā Zaydun fatuḥsinu 'ilayhi* 'no one but Zayd stood, and you will benefit him', only *raf'* is possible after *fa-*, because the preceding utterance is positive.¹⁴⁶

4.3.2. *The utterance preceding fa- contains a negation with ġayr*

According to Ibn al-Sarrāj, when the utterance preceding *fa-* is negated by *ġayr*, the following verb cannot take *naṣb*, as in the ungrammatical sentence **'anta ġayru qā'imīn fana'tiyaka* 'you are not standing and [as a result] we will not come to you'. He rejects the opinion of some grammarians who allow *naṣb* in such sentences because, so he argues, the compound with *ġayr* cannot be represented in the *taqdīr* structure by a verbal noun (according to Sībawayhi and most grammarians, *naṣb* following *fa-* is explained by a *taqdīr* structure in which a verbal noun occurs; see §7.1).¹⁴⁷

The contrary opinion, that *naṣb* is allowed in such constructions, is attributed to the Kūfans,¹⁴⁸ and supported by Ibn Mālik.¹⁴⁹

4.3.3. *The utterance preceding fa- contains forms of 'asmā' al-fi'*¹⁵⁰

According to Ibn al-Sarrāj, when the utterance preceding *fa-* consists of a form belonging to the category of *'asmā' al-fi'*, the following verb cannot

¹⁴⁵ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 184, 3–9. Cf., for example, al-Fārisī, *Ḥalabīyyāt*, 266, –2–267, 2.

¹⁴⁶ See al-Fārisī, *Ḥalabīyyāt*, 267, 2; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 65, 2–9. Cf. Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 154, 1–7; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 268, 10–15; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1676, 7–9.

¹⁴⁷ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 184, 9–14. Cf. al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 64, 12–16, where the author says that grammarians who allow *naṣb* do it *qiyāsan lā samā'an* 'as an analogy [to similar examples without *ġayr*] and not due to having heard [such examples with *ġayr*]'.
¹⁴⁸ See Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 155, 8–13; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 124, 4–10.

¹⁴⁹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 133, 1–4; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taḥṣīl* II.2, 32, 12–33, 2; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 337, –1–338, 2. For grammarians who mention Ibn Mālik's opinion and attribute it to the Kūfans, see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1676, 5–6; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 87, 9–11.

¹⁵⁰ These are forms of interjections, most of which denote a command, but are conceived as nouns, such as *nazālī* 'go down!'. On *'asmā' al-fi'*, see Levin, *'Asmā'*.

take *naṣb*, because the literal utterance contains no verbal form (which can be represented in the *taqdīr* structure by a verbal noun; cf. §4.3.2).¹⁵¹

4.3.4. *The utterance preceding fa- contains qad lil-taqlīl*¹⁵²

According to al-Astarābādī, when the utterance preceding *fa-* contains *qad lil-taqlīl*, *naṣb* following *fa-* is not possible, as in the ungrammatical example **qad tajī'unī fatukrimanī* 'little do you come to me, and [as a result] you honor me'. Al-Astarābādī acknowledges that some grammarians do allow *naṣb* in such sentences and adds that they do it *qiyāsan lā samā'an*.¹⁵³

5. COMPARISON BETWEEN SENTENCE TYPES IN WHICH THE JAWĀB FOLLOWING FA- IS MAJZŪM AND MAṢŪB

5.1. *Sībawayhi*

In chapter 253 of the *Kitāb Sībawayhi* discusses sentence types in which the first part consists of a command, a prohibition, a question, etc., and the second part is a *jawāb* in *jazm*. Such sentences are similar to those with *fa-* followed by *naṣb* in several respects: the nature of the first part, the meaning of a conditional sentence that they convey and the fact that the second part is *jawāb*. But contrary to sentences in which *fa-* is followed by *naṣb*, here the *jawāb* lacks *fa-* and occurs in *jazm*. This section is devoted to a comparison between the two kinds of sentences.

The title of chapter 253 is *hādā bābun min al-jazā'i yanjazimu fihī l-fi'lu 'idā kāna jawāban li'amrin 'aw nahyin 'awi stīfhāmin 'aw taman-nin 'aw arḍin* 'this is a chapter [devoted to sentence types which have the meaning] of a conditional sentence in which the verb takes *jazm*, when it is a *jawāb* to command, prohibition, question, wish or light urging'. At the beginning of this chapter Sībawayhi provides examples of the five sentence types mentioned in its title. The first example is *i'tinī 'ātika* 'come to me and [then] I will come to you',¹⁵⁴ which possesses a

¹⁵¹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 186, 3–7. For an extended discussion of this issue, see Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'is* (1990) III, 49–51, where the author shares Ibn al-Sarrāj's view, but also acknowledges examples in which *fa-* is followed by *naṣb* when the preceding utterance consists of one of the following 'asmā' al-fi': *darāki* 'take!', *naẓālī* 'go down!' and *naẓārī* 'wait!'. Cf. Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 150, 4–10.

¹⁵² The literal meaning of this term is '*qad* [which is used] to [denote] rarity'. It precedes the imperfect verb and denotes that the action conveyed by the verb occurred only few times. On *qad lil-taqlīl* see, for example, Wright, *Grammar* I, 286, §362(z).

¹⁵³ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 64, 14–16. Cf. note 147.

¹⁵⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 399, 6–7.

structure known as *jawāb al-'amr*.¹⁵⁵ Sībawayhi subsequently discusses and explains the conditional meaning of such sentences.¹⁵⁶ From the title of chapter 253 and Sībawayhi's subsequent examples it is clear that almost all sentence types discussed with respect to *fā-* followed by *naṣb* are also represented here with respect to *jawāb* in *jazm* (see §§3.1.1–3.1.5). The only exception is the sentence type introduced by a negative utterance. Sībawayhi then compares the sentence types in which the *jawāb* is *majzūm* and those in which it is introduced by *fā-* followed by *naṣb*, as follows.¹⁵⁷

According to Sībawayhi the sentence *lā tadnu minhu* (according to the subsequent discussion: *mina l-'asadi*) *yakun xayran laka* 'do not come close to it (i.e. the lion), and [then] it will be good for you', is grammatical, but one should not say **lā tadnu mina l-'asadi ya'kulka* 'do not come close to the lion, [for then] it will eat you', because the intended meaning is not to make your not coming close to the lion the reason for the lion's eating you.¹⁵⁸ He subsequently mentions two synonymous sentences in which the verb is *marfū'* and *manṣūb*, respectively: *lā tadnu mina l-'asadi ya'kuluka*, the *taqdīr* of which is *lā tadnu mina l-'asadi fa'innahu ya'kuluka* 'do not come close to the lion, because [then] it will eat you!'; and *lā tadnu mina l-'asadi faya'kulaka* 'do not come close to the lion lest it eat you!' (cf. al-Rummānī's words in §2.3.1-a). Sībawayhi concludes this discussion with the comment that not every sentence type in which *fā-* is followed by *naṣb* can be associated with a corresponding sentence type which has a meaning equivalent to a conditional sentence and consists of *jawāb* in

¹⁵⁵ On the structure of *jawāb al-'amr* 'the *jawāb* of the imperative', in which the first part consists of an imperative verb and the second a *jawāb* in *jazm*, see, for example, Wright, *Grammar* II, 37–38, §17(c)β.

¹⁵⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 399, 7–13. For al-Šantamarī's commentary see al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 747, 3–10. Cf. al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 112, 20–113, 3.

¹⁵⁷ For the whole discussion see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 400, 14–21. For al-Šantamarī's commentary see al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 748, 2–10.

¹⁵⁸ This sentence which Sībawayhi rejects is reported as acceptable by al-Kisā'ī, because its meaning is 'in *tadnu mina l-'asadi ya'kulka* 'if you come close to the lion, it will eat you'. For grammarians who attribute this view to al-Kisā'ī, see, for example, al-Baṭalyawsi, *Islāh*, 263, 11–14; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Kāfiya* (1998) IV, 121, –4–3; al-Astarābādi, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 127, 3–to end; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 129, 9–130, 7; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣhīl* II.2, 42, 8–44, 4.

Trumpf suggests a way to reconcile Sībawayhi's and al-Kisā'ī's opinions. The former he takes to conceive of *lā tadnu mina l-'asadi yakun xayran laka* as a conditional sentence, and the latter's view is possible if the opposite sentence *lā tadnu mina l-'asadi ya'kulka* is understood as a prohibition and warning followed by a call for caution (*Mahnung zur Vorsicht*), i.e. 'do not come close to the lion lest it eat you!'. See Trumpf, *Bedingungssatz*, 55, 3ff. Cf. Peled, *Conditional*, 36–37.

jazm. He exemplifies this with *mā 'ataytanā fatuḥaddītanā* (discussed in §3.1.1.3), which has no corresponding equivalent sentence with *jawāb* in *jazm* (this sentence stands for all examples of the sentence type in which the utterance preceding *fa-* is negative).

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not explicitly refer to this issue.

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Ibn al-Sarrāj compares sentences in which the *jawāb* is *majzūm* and those in which it is introduced by *fa-* followed by a verb in *naṣb*. His lengthy discussion focuses mainly on the different *taqdīr* structures in these two sentence types. In the former the *taqdīr* is a conditional sentence which includes the verb, as in *qum 'u'ṭika* 'stand and [then] I will give you [something]', the *taqdīr* of which is 'in *taqum 'u'ṭika* 'if you stand, I will give you [something]'. In the latter, the *taqdīr* is not a conditional sentence but a conjunction of a *manṣūb* verb and a *maṣdar* which is equivalent to two attached nouns, as in *laysa ta'tinī fatuḥaddītanī* (for the two possible meanings, see §3.1.1.2), the *taqdīr* of which is *laysa 'ityānun faḥadīṭun* 'there is no coming and conversation' (see further §7.1 for Sibawayhi's explanation of this *taqdīr* structure).¹⁵⁹

Al-Zajjājī, unlike other grammarians, incorrectly claims that a *jawāb* in *jazm* can follow a negation,¹⁶⁰ and for this he is criticized.¹⁶¹ Most grammarians who discuss the sentence types in which the *jawāb* is *majzūm* mention all those in which *fa-* is followed by *naṣb* except for the one introduced by negation.¹⁶² Some explicitly argue that a *jawāb* to a negative utterance must consist of *fa-* followed by *naṣb* (i.e. *jawāb* in *jazm* is not possible).¹⁶³ Of the few grammarians who do not only

¹⁵⁹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 180, 5–181, 3; 183, 11–184, 3.

¹⁶⁰ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 217, 1–7 (cf. al-Xwārazmī, *Maḥāṭib*, 64, 4 last lines), where the author exemplifies all other sentence types in which the *jawāb* is *majzūm* except that introduced by negation. The reason is simple: no example is possible because *jawāb* in *jazm* cannot follow a negation.

¹⁶¹ For the criticism of al-Zajjājī's view see al-Baṭalyawī, *ʿIṣlāḥ*, 263, 8–11; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 81, 4–5; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 96, 4–8; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 133, 7–12. Cf. Trumpp, *Bedingungssatz*, 53 (beginning of §3).

¹⁶² See, for example, al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 108–109; al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 85, 7–10.

¹⁶³ See al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 111, 2–4; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 44, 2 last lines; 45, 1–4; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 209, 4 last lines; Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 177, 4–11; al-Muṭarrizī, *Mišbāḥ*, 82, –3–83, 3; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣṣīl* II.2, 39, 1ff.; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 297, 13–15.

state this but also provide explanations are al-Jurjānī, al-Zamaxšarī and al-ʿUkbarī.¹⁶⁴

6. DIALECTAL DIFFERENCES RELATED TO THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING *fa*-

6.1. *Sibawayhi*

In Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* there is no reference to this issue.

6.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', like Sibawayhi, does not explicitly refer to this issue.

6.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians do not mention any dialectal differences related to the mood of the verb following *fa*-. Two exceptions are al-Axfaš and al-Naḥḥās, who attribute dialectal use in specific sentence types to the Banū Tamīm, with respect to Qur'ānic verses in which the verb following *fa*- can take either *rafʿ* or *naṣb*.

In his commentary on Qur'ān 2:245 (translated and explained in §3.2.2) al-Axfaš argues, like other grammarians, that both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* are possible in the verb following *fa*-, but adds that: *wal-rafʿu luḡatu banī Tamīm* 'and *rafʿ* is a dialectal use of the Banū Tamīm'.¹⁶⁵ The editor of al-Axfaš's *Maʿānī* notes that no other source makes this claim,¹⁶⁶ but this is inaccurate. In fact, al-Naḥḥās comments on a line of poetry in which the utterance preceding *fa*- is negative and *fa*- is followed by *naṣb*: *wamā qāma minnā qā'imun fī nadiyyinā / fayantiqa 'illā billatī hiya 'a'rafu* (for a translation see §3.1.1.4). In his commentary he mentions two verses of the same sentence type (Qur'ān 35:36 and 77:36; the first is translated in §3.1.1.2 above and the second in chapter 11, §2) in which he argues that both *rafʿ* and *naṣb* are possible in the verb following *fa*-, and adds that the

¹⁶⁴ See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 162; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaššal*, 113, 6–9; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 64; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 955–956. See also al-Zamaxšarī, *Aḥājī*, 69, –3–70, 8; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 194, 7 last lines; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 121, –2ff.; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 129, 9–12; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Šarḥ*, 486, 19–24; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1683, 14–1685, 5; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 333, 1ff.

¹⁶⁵ See al-Axfaš, *Maʿānī* (1985) I, 376, –1–377, 4.

¹⁶⁶ See al-Axfaš, *Maʿānī* (1985) I, 377, note 1.

Banū Tamīm put the verb following *fa-* in *rafʿ* or *naṣb*, when the preceding utterance is negated by *mā*, *lā* or *laysa*.¹⁶⁷

7. WHAT INDUCES THE VERB FOLLOWING *FA-* TO BE *MANṢŪB*?

Since grammarians' opinions on what induces the verb following *fa-* to take *naṣb* are very similar to their views on the parallel question with respect to *'aw* (see chapter 5, §4), only explicit statements on *fa-* are presented below.

7.1. *Sībawayhi*

At the beginning of chapter 241 of the *Kitāb Sībawayhi* argues that the mood of the verb following *fa-* is due to the influence of an *'an muḍmara*.¹⁶⁸ Using the main example in this chapter, *lā ta'tīnī fatuḥaddītanī*, he explains the process which accounts for this *'an muḍmara*.¹⁶⁹ The essence of his explanation is a *taqdīr* structure in which both verbs change to nouns: *laysa yakūnu minka 'ityānun faḥadīṭun* 'an act of coming and an act of conversation were not performed by you'. The *naṣb* mood of the verb following *fa-* in the literal utterance is thus explained as due to an *'an muḍmara*, since *'an tuḥaddītanī* is equivalent to *ḥadīṭun* in the *taqdīr* structure (*'an* and the following *manṣūb* verb are equivalent to a verbal noun; for a thorough discussion see chapter 1, §2).¹⁷⁰ Sībawayhi subsequently emphasizes that this *'an* should not be pronounced in the literal utterance.¹⁷¹

7.2. *Al-Farrā'*

According to al-Farrā' the *naṣb* mood following *fa-*, as well as other conjunctions, is due to *xilāf*. For an explanation of this principle, see appendix A, §16.

7.3. *Other grammarians*

7.3.1. *The verb following fa- is manṣūb due to 'an muḍmara*

Most grammarians agree with Sībawayhi that an *'an muḍmara* induces the *naṣb* mood of the verb following *fa-* and some also make the *taqdīr* struc-

¹⁶⁷ See al-Naḥḥās, *Šarḥ*, 54, 3–8.

¹⁶⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 15.

¹⁶⁹ This process is discussed in detail in Levin, *Taqdīr*, 149–150, §3.5, example (2). Cf. Mosel, *Sībawayhi* I, 53, §3.2.2.2; Ayoub, *Tamṭīl*, 5; 8–9; Ba'albakī, *Fā'*, 189.

¹⁷⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 17–373, 1.

¹⁷¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 373, 1–7.

ture explicit.¹⁷² Three of the most thorough explanations are al-Sirāfi's, Ibn Jinnī's and Ibn Ya'īš's.¹⁷³

The grammarians agree with Sībawayhi that 'an following *fa-* in the literal utterance is impermissible.¹⁷⁴ Some also provide theoretical arguments for this view.¹⁷⁵ Ibn al-Sarrāj states that an overt 'an cannot appear after *fa-* when the following verb is attached to the meaning of the preceding verb and not to its form.¹⁷⁶ In light of a similar explanation on *wa-* (see chapter 7, §6.3.1 and the references in note 98 there), it is clear that he means that only when *fa-* conveys the special meaning of a result, which is thoroughly discussed in this chapter, should 'an not be pronounced in the literal utterance, but when *fa-* connects a verb to a noun, and this verb is thus *manṣūb*, *fa-* preserves its regular meaning as a conjunction and 'an may optionally be used (see appendix A, §2).

7.3.2. *The verb following fa- is manṣūb due to xilāf*

The view that the verb following *fa-* is *manṣūb* due to *xilāf* is attributed to al-Farrā' in particular and to the Kūfans in general.¹⁷⁷

7.3.3. *The verb following fa- is manṣūb due to the influence of fa- itself*

This opinion is attributed to the Baṣran grammarian al-Jarmī,¹⁷⁸ and some attribute it to al-Kisā'i as well.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷² See, for example, al-Axfaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 221, 1–2; 222, 3–7; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 14, 7–8; 14, 11–13; 15, 4–7; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 153, 16–154, 3; al-Sirāfi quoted in al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 150, end of note 2; al-Fārisī, *Idāh* II, 1061, 4 last lines and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1062, 1–1064, 15; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 44, 1–4; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 51, 18; al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 109, –110, 1; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 38, 5–10.

¹⁷³ See al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) II, 233–234; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 272, 2–to end; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 933, 15–23.

¹⁷⁴ See, for example, al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 77, 3–4; al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, ll. 16–18; al-Fārisī, *Idāh* II, 1060, 2 last lines; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 276, 3–8; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 52, 4; Ibn Mālik, *Alfiyya*, 161, 9 (Arabic text) and 160–162 (the editor's remarks); Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 295, 2 last lines.

¹⁷⁵ See, for example, al-Warrāq, *Ilal*, 274, 12–14; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 167, –2–168, 2; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 433, 4–6; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Amālī* II, 600, 10–12 (part of 'imlā' 80).

¹⁷⁶ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 151, 3–4.

¹⁷⁷ See, for example, al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 38, 1–2; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 143, 16–18; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 84, 12.

¹⁷⁸ See, for example, al-Naḥḥās, *Yrāb* I, 214, 5–7; IV, 355, 7–9; al-Sirāfi quoted in al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 150, end of note 2; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 159, 3 last lines; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 168, 4.

¹⁷⁹ See, for example, Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1668, 7–10; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 84, 12–13. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Aṣbāḥ* (1998) II, 384, 12–13, where the author refers only to *madḥab al-Kisā'i wa'aṣḥābihi* 'the school of al-Kisā'i and his friends (i.e. those who share his *madḥab*)' and does not mention al-Jarmī.

7.3.4. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans on the ‘āmil which induces naṣb following fa-*

Ibn al-Anbārī discusses this question in his *ʿInṣāf*.¹⁸⁰ The opinions he presents correspond to the three opinions mentioned in §§7.3.1–7.3.3 above.

8. CONCLUSION

The mood of the imperfect verb following *fa-* is one of the most complex subjects in Arabic syntax. The analysis in this chapter supports Baʿalbakī’s conclusion that there is a fundamental difference between Sibawayhi’s thorough treatment of this subject, in which form and meaning are treated as closely intertwined, and the rather technical discussions of later grammarians (see §3.4 towards the end).

At the beginning of chapter 241 of his *Kitāb* Sibawayhi shows that the verb following *fa-* can occur in any one of the moods (*rafʿ*; *naṣb* and *jazm*) and explains the semantic and syntactic environments in which each of these moods can occur (see §2.1): any one of the moods can occur and be explained due to *ʾiṣrāk*; *naṣb* can occur under certain circumstances due to an *ʾan muḍmara* (this is the main topic of the chapter); and *rafʿ* can occur and be explained due to *inqiṭāʿ*. Sibawayhi subsequently discusses at length the sentence types in which *fa-* can be followed by a *manṣūb* verb (see §3.1), all of which share the characteristic that they are introduced by an utterance which is not an indicative sentence that denotes certainty, but rather conveys a negated, hoped for or hypothetical action. Afterwards he presents the sentence types which are introduced by indicative sentences which do denote certainty, following which *fa-* is usually not to be found with a *manṣūb* verb, unless due to poetic license (see §4.1).

As a whole, Sibawayhi’s *bāb al-fāʾ* is based on numerous examples from Bedouin speech, the Qurʾān and poetry. He also discusses some examples in which the mood following *fa-* is not as expected according to the rules, and clarifies this as poetic license.¹⁸¹

¹⁸⁰ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʿInṣāf*, 230–232 (*masʾala* 76).

¹⁸¹ Some modern scholars add other examples of poetry in which *naṣb* occurs instead of the expected *rafʿ* or vice versa. See especially Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 70–71, §58. Others mention similar examples from prose from various corpora. See, for example, Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 462, 7–14 (end of §230), where the author quotes examples from al-Ṭabarī’s and al-Buxārī’s books (cf. Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 749 (end of §244)); Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 487–488, §302.i, note.

A comparison of Sībawayhi's and al-Farrā's discussions of the sentence types in which it is possible to find *naṣb* following *fā-*, reveals that both grammarians generally refer to the same types. Two main differences can be mentioned: first, Sībawayhi's presentation is more systematic than al-Farrā's (this difference may be accounted for largely by the fact that Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* is a grammar book *per se* while al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī* treats grammatical problems in the Qur'ān); secondly, they explain *naṣb* following *fā-* in different ways (viz. an *'an muḍmara* vs. *xilāf*), each of which accounts not only for this conjunction but for additional conjunctions and contexts.

Later grammarians tend to repeat Sībawayhi's ideas and to clarify them. Sometimes there are additions which concern mainly theoretical issues (see, for example, §§4.3.2–4.3.4).

CHAPTER SEVEN

WA-

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to *wa-*, one of the conjunctions following which the verb is *manṣūb* under certain conditions. All grammarians emphasize that in most sentence types in which *wa-* is followed by a verb in *naṣb*, it denotes a meaning other than ‘and’, its regular meaning as a conjunction. However, when a noun and a *manṣūb* verb are connected by *wa-*, this *wa-* is taken as denoting its regular meaning ‘and’, and the *naṣb* mood of the verb is explained as due to ‘*atf*’ between two disparate elements, viz. a noun and a verb.¹ This principle applies not only to *wa-*, but to the other conjunctions, too; for details on this ‘*atf*’ see appendix A, §2. It is noteworthy that whereas Sībawayhi and most other grammarians refer to this sentence type, al-Farrā’ does not.

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi discusses *wa-* in chapter 242 (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 10–380, 7), which is connected to the previous chapter which treats *fa-* but is significantly shorter. In chapter 242 he treats the meaning of *wa-* followed by *naṣb*, the ‘*an muḍmara*’ which induces this mood, and the syntactic environments in which the verb can also take *rafʿ*.

1.2. *Al-Farrā’*

Al-Farrā’ in his *Maʿānī* refers to some occurrences of an imperfect verb following *wa-* which is, or can be taken as, *manṣūb* (in some verses the verbal form can reflect both *naṣb* and *jazm*). He explains *naṣb* as due to *ṣarf*.

¹ This observation is contrary to Baʿalbakī’s view (see Baʿalbakī, *Wāw*, 13, note 3) that in all sentence types where the verb following *wa-* is *manṣūb*, *wa-* has the special meaning of *maʿīyya* (this meaning is discussed in §4). In addition, his claim that the distinction described above is not found in Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb* but only in later sources, such as Ibn Hišām’s *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, is refuted by examples in the *Kitāb* and in Ibn al-Sarrāj’s *ʿUṣūl*; see appendix A, §2.1-c and §2.3, respectively.

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Like Sībawayhi, early and later grammarians usually devote shorter discussions to *wa-* than to *fa-*. Since *naṣb* following both conjunctions occurs *grosso modo* in the same sentence types, the grammarians' discussions of *wa-* and *fa-* share many characteristics. An extreme example can be found in Ibn Hišām's commentary on Ibn Mālik's *ʿAlfiyya*, where he discusses and exemplifies these two conjunctions together.²

1.4. *Secondary sources*

In line with most grammarians, modern scholars treat *naṣb* following *wa-* less extensively than they treat *naṣb* following *fa-*. One early modern scholar who devotes a relative extensive discussion to *wa-* is Kosegarten.³ Two studies which also deserve mention here are Baʿalbakī's article on the *naṣb* mood of the verb following *wa-* and its meaning (Baʿalbakī, *Wāw*) and Carter's article on the technical terms *ṣarf* and *xilāf*, which are attributed to the Kūfans and related to the *naṣb* mood following the conjunctions in general and *wa-* in particular (Carter, *Ṣarf*). Finally, Ḥasan's *al-Naḥw al-wāfi* contains valuable data extracted from various grammarians' books, but he does not give references to his quoted sources.⁴

2. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING *WA-*2.1. *Sībawayhi*

At the beginning of chapter 242 Sībawayhi states that *wa-* and *fa-* are syntactically similar but semantically different. Therefore, what he states with respect to the syntactic environment of the *manṣūb* verb following *fa-* (see chapter 6, §2.1) also holds good with respect to *wa-*.⁵

² See Ibn Hišām, *ʿAwḍaḥ* II, 81–86. Similarly, in his commentary on Sībawayhi's *ṣawāhid* from poetry, al-Naḥḥās discusses verses with *fa-* as well as those with *wa-* in the same chapter, *bāb al-fāʾ*. See al-Naḥḥās, *Ṣarḥ*, 159–162 (this was already observed by Baʿalbakī; see Baʿalbakī, *Wāw*, 7, 3–6).

³ See Kosegarten, *Grammatica*, 590–591, §1265, where the author treats the meaning of *wa-* followed by *naṣb*, the sentence types in which a verb in this mood can occur and some of the grammarians' terms used in conjunction with it: *wāw al-ṣarf*, *wāw al-jamʿ* and *wāw al-maʿyya* (see a detailed discussion of these terms and others in §2.3).

⁴ See Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 375–386.

⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 10–14.

2.1.1. *The naṣb mood induced by 'an muḍmara (for Sībawayhi's theory of 'an muḍmara see §6.1)*

The sentence types in which *naṣb* is induced by an *'an muḍmara* are the main topic of discussion in chapter 242, which begins with a statement on their common characteristic: the utterance preceding *wa-* is *ḡayr wājib*, i.e. it is not an indicative sentence denoting certainty (on *wājib* see appendix A, §15).⁶

2.1.2. *Any of the three moods (raf', naṣb and jazm) may occur, depending on the mood of the verb preceding wa-*

The guiding principle here is that *wa-* is used as a regular conjunction which connects two imperfect verbs that occupy the same syntactic position and thus take the same mood. With respect to *wa-*, Sībawayhi refers to the possibility of *'iṣrāk*, whereas in the context of *fa-* he mentions another possibility as well (see chapter 6, §2.1.2; on *'iṣrāk* see appendix A, §5.1).⁷

2.1.3. *Inqīṭā' as an explanation for the raf' mood of the verb following wa-* Sībawayhi refers to this possibility immediately after mentioning *'iṣrāk*.⁸ Here the verb following *wa-* takes *raf'* due to the fact that it introduces a new sentence and is thus taken as its predicate. For a discussion and Sībawayhi's relevant examples see appendix A, §4.1.

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' discusses the possible mood of the verb following *wa-* in several places in his *Ma'ānī*, each time referring to a relevant Qur'ānic verse. He posits the same three possible explanations for this mood as Sībawayhi (discussed in §§2.1.1–2.1.3 above). The main difference between their views lies in their explanation of what induces *naṣb* in the first possibility (see §6).

2.2.1. *The naṣb mood*

Al-Farrā' starts his main discussion of *naṣb* following *wa-* with his commentary on Qur'ān 2:42, the first verse which presents a verb following *wa-* which could be taken as *manṣūb* (the associated verbal form can be also conceived as *majzūm*; see §3.1.3-c for Sībawayhi's interpretation).

⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 10–11.

⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 11–12. Al-Mubarrad, on the other hand, refers to both possibilities with respect to *wa-*; see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 25, 3–6.

⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 12–13.

Al-Farrā' explains that *naṣb* in this case is due to *ṣarf* and defines this concept (for a thorough explanation see appendix A, §13).

2.2.2. *Any of the three moods (raf', naṣb and jazm) may occur, depending on the mood of the verb preceding wa-*

Al-Farrā' calls this possibility by the name *'itbā'*; it is equivalent to Sibawayhi's *'iṣrāk* (see §2.1.2 above and appendix A, §§5.1–5.2).

2.2.3. *Isti'nāf as an explanation for the raf' mood of the verb following wa-*
The technical term which al-Farrā' uses to indicate this possibility is *isti'nāf*, which is equivalent to Sibawayhi's *inqiṭā'* (see §2.1.3 above and appendix A, §§4.1–4.2).

2.3. Other grammarians

2.3.1. *The terminology associated with wa- followed by a verb in the naṣb mood*

Some grammarians and lexicographers do not refer at all to *wa-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb.⁹ Most grammarians who do, call it *wāw al-jam'* 'wa- of joining', since it joins two actions (see §4.3.1).¹⁰ Some state that it is also called *wāw al-ṣarf*.¹¹ Although this term derives from al-Farrā's (and the Kūfans') terminology with respect to what induces *naṣb*, various grammarians, not necessarily Kūfans,¹² use it, usually in conjunction with the Baṣrans' theory of *'an muḍmara*.¹³

⁹ See al-Naḍr b. Ṣumayl, *Risāla*, 166, 7 last lines, where *wa-* followed by the *naṣb* mood is not mentioned among the fourteen kinds of *wa-*; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍih*, 73–75, where the *naṣb* mood is discussed, but neither *fa-* nor *wa-* are mentioned (although the author does dedicate a subsequent chapter to the former). Similarly, the classical Arabic dictionaries *al-Ayn*, *Tāj al-luḡa* and *al-Muxaṣṣaṣ* contain no references to this kind of *wa-*. For their discussions of *wāw* see al-Xalīl, *Ayn* VIII, 437; 444; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 577–578; Ibn Sida, *Muxaṣṣaṣ* XIV, 47–48.

¹⁰ See al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 7–9; al-Jurjānī, *Ṣarḥ al-jumal*, 153, 2–16; al-Zamaxṣarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 109, –110, 1; Ibn al-Xaṣṣāb, *Murtajal*, 206, 16; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjih*, 365, 4ff.; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Ṣarḥ* II, 33, 16; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Amālī* I, 304, 6; al-Astarābādī, *Ṣarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 66, 2–4; Ibn Mālik, *Ṣarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 125, 5; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 232, 1–2; Ibn Mālik, *Ṣarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 44, 10; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Irṣād* II, 369, –3–2; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 126, 5; al-Kaffawī, *Kulliyāt*, 923a, 5–8.

¹¹ Al-Jurjānī in his *Jumal*, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya and al-Kaffawī; for references see previous note.

¹² *Contra* Ibn Hišām's statement that only Kūfans use this term. See Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) II, 32, 9–10.

¹³ See al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 80, 15; 81, 3; al-Xwārazmī, *Ṣarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* III, 234, 13–14; 235, –1–236, 1; 224, 7–9; al-Astarābādī, *Ṣarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 13, 10–11; 68, 7. Early and later grammarians use the formulation *manṣūb 'alā l-ṣarf*, but subsequently explain the

Only later grammarians, from the time of Ibn Mālik, begin to use the term *muṣāḥaba* ‘simultaneous occurrence’ (of the actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *wa-*).¹⁴ To convey the same notion of a simultaneous occurrence, Ibn Hišām uses the terms *wāw al-ma’iyya* and *al-wāw lil-ma’iyya*.¹⁵

Al-Suyūṭī connects the above-mentioned terms *jam‘* and *ma’iyya* in his definition of this kind of *wa-*: *al-wāwu ‘idā kānat lil-jam‘i fī l-zamāni ‘awi l-ma’iyyati llatī hiya ‘aḥadu muḥtamalātihā ‘wa- which occurs for joining in time [the two actions denoted by the preceding and following verbs] or for the simultaneous occurrence [of these two actions], which is one of its possible meanings (i.e. of wāw)’*.¹⁶

2.3.2. *Any of the three moods (raf‘, naṣb and jazm) may occur, depending on the mood of the verb preceding wa-*

Most grammarians mention this possibility, which Sībawayhi calls *‘iṣrāk* and al-Farrā’ calls *‘itbā’*. For relevant examples see appendix A, §5.3.

2.3.3. *Explaining the raf‘ mood of the verb following wa- as due to this verb introducing a new utterance*

Most grammarians mention this explanation, which Sībawayhi calls *inqiṭā‘* and al-Farrā’ calls *isti’nāf*. For relevant examples see appendix A, §4.3.

3. SENTENCE TYPES IN WHICH A *MANṢŪB* VERB CAN FOLLOW *WA-* AND THE MEANING OF *NAṢB*

As a rule all the sentence types in which a *manṣūb* verb can follow *fa-* can also occur with *wa-* followed by *naṣb* since, as Sībawayhi explains, these conjunctions are syntactically similar though semantically different (see the beginning of §2.1). Nevertheless, one type which both Sībawayhi

naṣb mood as due to an *‘an muḍmara*. See, for example, al-Zajjāj, *‘Iṣrāb* I, 393, 8–394, 12; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 223, 4–5. Cf. al-Rummānī, *Šarḥ*, 329–335, where the editor explains that al-Rummānī’s view with respect to the question of what induces *naṣb* following *wa-* is like Sībawayhi’s, i.e. that this mood is due to an *‘an muḍmara*, but the terminology which he uses in his commentary on the *Kitāb* is the Kūfans’, viz. *naṣb ‘alā l-ṣarf*.

¹⁴ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 124, 12–13; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ‘umda*, 337, 9; 340, 6–7; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 482, 1; 484, 15–16; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 321, 2–3; 327, 1–2; Ibn ‘Aqil, *Šarḥ*, 296, 2 last lines; al-Jāmī, *Šarḥ* II, 250, 4–5.

¹⁵ For the former see Ibn Hišām, *‘Awḍaḥ* II, 81, 4; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 76, 6; Ibn Hišām, *Jāmi‘*, 173, 2. For the latter see Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) II, 31, 2–5 (cf. Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *‘Iršād* II, 369, –3–2).

¹⁶ See al-Suyūṭī, *Ham‘* IV, 126, 8–9.

and al-Farrā' mention with examples in their discussions of *fa-* does not appear in their discussions of *wa-*: when the utterance preceding *fa-* is a hypothetical clause (see chapter 6, §3.1.5 and §3.2.5).

3.1. *Sibawayhi*

As mentioned in §2.1.1 above, whenever *wa-* is followed by a *manṣūb* verb the utterance preceding this conjunction is *ḡayr wājib* (for the reference see note 6 above). In the following sections I present and discuss Sibawayhi's examples of each sentence type, taken from the spoken language of the Bedouins, the Qur'ān and ancient poetry.

3.1.1. *The utterance preceding wa- is negative*

- a. *Lā yasa'unī šay'un waya'jiza 'anka* 'there is nothing I can do that is [at the same time] difficult for you', i.e. nothing that I am capable of doing is [at the same time] difficult for you.¹⁷ Sibawayhi records the same sentence with *fa-* instead of *wa-* in the chapter devoted to the former,¹⁸ and in his discussion of *wa-* he states that *naṣb* in both sentences occurs in the same way (i.e. due to an '*an muḍmara*'), although *wa-* and *fa-* differ in their *mawḍi'* (literally: 'position' or 'place') in speech. It would seem that the different *mawḍi'*s that Sibawayhi attributes to these two conjunctions stand for the different meanings they convey, since he explicitly states at the beginning of chapter 242 that *wa-* and *fa-* are syntactically similar but semantically different.¹⁹

¹⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 7–8. Ibn al-Sarrāj explains this example in the following words: *lā yaftamī'u 'an yasa'anī šay'un waya'jiza 'anka* 'it does not happen at the same time that I can do something and that it (i.e. this thing) is difficult for you'. See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 154, 15–155, 1; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 80, 3–5. Cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 52, 18–53, 1; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1071, 14–1072, 3. For explanations of why putting the verb in *raf'* would lead to an absurd meaning ('there is nothing I can do and nothing is difficult for you' or 'there is nothing I can do and something is difficult for you', as *'iṣrāk* and *inqiṭā'*, respectively), see al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 435, 12–436, 1; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 41, –1–42, 3.

¹⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, –1–375, 1.

¹⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 13–14 and §2.1 above. I thus disagree with Jahn who interprets *mawḍi'* here as *eine andere syntaktische Stellung* 'a different syntactic position' which *wa-* and *fa-* occupy (see Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 159, 28). For a thorough discussion of the technical term *mawḍi'*, see Versteegh, *Syntactic position*, 271–275.

For al-Fārisī's and al-Jurjānī's thorough explanations on the different meanings of the sentences *lā yasa'unī šay'un waya'jiza 'anka* and *lā yasa'unī šay'un fayā'jiza 'anka* (which literally differ in the conjunction only), see al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 148, 9–to end (*mas'ala* 158); al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1071, 14ff.

- b. *Qataltu bi'Abdi llāhi xayra lidātihi / Du'āban falam 'afxar biḍālika wa'ajza'ā* 'I killed [as retaliation] for [the killing of] 'Abdallāh the best of his contemporaries,²⁰ Du'āb [al-Asadī], and I neither boasted about it nor was I [at the same time] anxious'.²¹
- c. *'Am ḥasibtum 'an tadxulū l-jannata walammā ya'lami llāhu llaḍīna jāhadū minkum waya'lama l-ṣābirīna* 'or did you think that you should enter paradise when God does not know who of you have struggled and [at the same time] knows who are patient?' (Qur'ān 3:142). Sibawayhi quotes this verse as an example for *naṣb* following *wa-* and adds that there also exists a *qirā'a* with *jazm*: *waya'lami l-ṣābirīna* (with a helping vowel at the end of the verb).²² Although he does not go into detail, it is clear that the reading with *jazm* is due to *'iṣrāk*: the negation particle *lammā* applies to both imperfect verbs preceding and following *wa-*. According to the reading with *jazm* the translation would be 'or did you think that you should enter paradise when God does not know who of you have struggled and who are patient?'.²³

3.1.2. *The utterance preceding wa- is a question, wish or desire*

- a. *'Alam 'aku jāarakum watakūna baynī / wabaynakumu l-mawaddatu wal-'ixā'u* 'am I not protected by you (or: your neighbor)²³ so that [at the same time] there are friendship and brotherhood between me and you?'.²⁴
- b. *Yā laytanā nuraddu walā nukaddiba bi'āyāti rabbīnā wanakūna minā l-mu'minīna* 'we wish that we would be returned so that we would [then] not cry lies to the signs of our Lord, but would be among the

²⁰ For the meaning of *lidāt*, the plural form of *lida*, see Hava, *Dictionary*, 893b. See also al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 394, 4 = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 425, -1; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 718, 6–7. See further Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 159, 23.

²¹ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Durayd b. al-Šimma. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 5–6, where he quotes this verse without any explanation. Other grammarians explain that *wa-* here has the meaning of *jam'*. See, for example, al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1072, 13–1073, 5; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 393–394 (verse 607) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 425; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 718, 3–8.

Note, however, that according to the version of the second hemistich in Durayd b. al-Šimma's *Dīwān* there is no evidence for *wa-* followed by *naṣb*: *waxayra ṣabābi l-nāsi law ḍumma 'ajma'ā* 'and the best of the people's youth, had he/they been joined, together'. See the editors' notes in al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 393, note 1470 and al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 718, note 91. Cf. Ya'qūb, *Šawāhid* I, 500 and especially note 1.

²² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 11–12.

²³ For the meanings of *jār* see Lane, *Lexicon* II, 483b–c.

²⁴ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by al-Ḥuṭay'a. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 2–5.

believers' (Qur'ān 6:27). Sībawayhi first quotes this verse with the two verbs following *wa-* in *raf'* and explains that this mood can have two explanations: *'iṣrāk* and *inqiṭā'*. He subsequently says that 'Abdallāh b. Abī Ishāq reads this verse with these verbs in *naṣb* (this is the version that is quoted and translated above).²⁵

3.1.3. *The utterance preceding wa- is a prohibition*

- a. *Lā ta'kuli l-samaka wataṣraba l-labna* 'do not eat fish and drink milk [at the same time²⁶]'. Sībawayhi says that the verb following *wa-* can be *majzūm* when the speaker's intention is to apply the *lā* of prohibition to both verbs. This *jazm* is thus explained as due to *'iṣrāk*, and the sentence would then be *lā ta'kuli l-samaka wataṣrabi l-labna* 'do not eat fish and [do not] drink milk!'.²⁷
- b. *Lā tanha 'an xuluqin wata'tiya miṭlahu / 'ārun 'alayka 'idā fa'alta 'aẓīmu* 'do not prohibit a trait and [at the same time] present a similar one! [Such an act will be] a great disgrace upon you, if you do [it]'.²⁸
- c. *Walā talbisū l-ḥaqqa bil-bāṭili wataktumū l-ḥaqqa wa'antum ta'lamūna* 'and do not confound the truth with vanity and [at the same time]

²⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 14–18.

²⁶ Jahn also adds the word *zugleich* 'at the same time' in his translation. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 159, 4. According to al-Astarābādī the condition for *naṣb* in the verb following *wa-* is [*an*] *yaftami'a maḍmūnu mā qablahā wamaḍmūnu mā ba'dahā fi zamānin wāḥidin* 'that the content of what precedes and follows it (i.e. the actions denoted by the preceding and following verbs) occurs at the same time'. See al-Astarābādī, *Ṣarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 76, 2–3. Cf. Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, *'Amālī* II, 865, 11–14 (part of *'imlā'* 188); Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 90, 14–17; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 126, 8–9 (for the quotation and translation see the end of §2.3.1).

It should be noted, however, that the meaning of co-occurrence fits most examples in this chapter, but not all; see §3.1.4-a and note 30 below.

²⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 18–20; 378, 22–379, 2. Cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 25, 6–10; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqa* II, 160, 2–3.

²⁸ A verse in the *kāmil* meter, probably by Abū l-Aswad al-Du'alī, although some attribute it to al-Aṭṭal. Abū l-Aswad al-Du'alī is the author of this verse according to al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ṣarḥ*, 260, 1–4; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjūh*, 364, 2; Ibn Hišām, *Ṣarḥ šuḍūr*, 218, –2; al-Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 393–394; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 126, –1; al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣarḥ šawāhid* (1904), 264. For grammarians who attribute the verse to al-Aṭṭal, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 14; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 392 (verse 604) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 424; Ibn Ya'īš, *Ṣarḥ* II, 932, 1; Ibn Mālik, *Ṣarḥ al-taḥṣīl* II.2, 36, 16. On the identity of the poet see also al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar* II, 23, 3–4; Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 227a, 14; Ya'qūb, *Šawāhid* II, 887–888.

This verse is quoted and discussed in Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 14–17. It is also quoted by al-Farrā', who argues that *jazm* following *wa-* would be possible (see §3.2.3-e), and by many succeeding grammarians. Some, for example al-Sirāfi, say that according to al-Aṣma'ī the verb following *wa-* takes *raf'*, which they explain in several ways (see §4.3.2 and the references in note 74 there).

conceal the truth wittingly!' (Qur'ān 2:42). Sībawayhi explains that the verb *taktumū* following *wa-* can be conceived as either *majzūm* due to the effect of the *lā* of prohibition (i.e. as *'iṣrāk*) or *manṣūb* due to the special meaning of *wa-* (as translated above). According to the former the verse means 'and do not confound the truth with vanity and [do not] conceal the truth wittingly!'.²⁹

3.1.4. *The utterance preceding wa- is a command*

- a. *Ptinī wa'ātiyaka* 'come to me so that I come to you'. Sībawayhi explains that the *taqdīr* structure of this sentence is *liyakun 'ityānun minka wa'an 'ātiyaka* 'let there be a coming from your side and that I come to you!' or in other words [*liyakun*] *'ityānun minka wa'ityānun minnī* 'let there be a coming from your side and a coming from my side!'.³⁰ Sībawayhi subsequently says that in order that the verb following *wa-* be understood as a command (as *'iṣrāk*), this verb should be introduced by *lām* (i.e. *lām al-'amr* 'li- of the imperative'), exactly as in the corresponding sentence type with *fa-* (cf. chapter 6, §3.1.4 and note 72 there). The sentence would then be *i'tinī wal'ātika* 'come to me and let me come to you!'.³¹
- b. *Faqltu dī wa'ad'ūwa 'inna 'andā / liṣawtin 'an yunādiya dā'iyāni* 'and I said: call and [then] I will call [at the same time]! It is louder for a voice that two express it'.³² Although in the *Kitāb* the verb is quoted as *wa'ad'ūwa*, in *naṣb*³³ (as it is by most other grammarians as well),³⁴

²⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 12–14.

³⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 8–9. This example is the only one in this chapter where the verb following *wa-* takes *naṣb* and which cannot convey the simultaneous occurrence of both actions indicated by the verbs preceding and following *wa-*; it is impossible that each of the two sides simultaneously come to the other. Jahn is thus mistaken when he adds the word *zugleich* to his translation here (see Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 159, 31). It seems that *naṣb* in this example results from the syntactic opposition between the verbs preceding and following *wa-* (imperative and imperfect, respectively). The meaning can be of joining the two actions, but not simultaneously. See further note 26 above and §4.1 dealing with the meaning of *wa-* followed by *naṣb* according to Sībawayhi.

³¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 9–10. For explanations on the sentence of the same type *zurnī wa'azūraka* 'visit me so that I visit you!', see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 26, 7–10; al-Fārisi, *ʿIqdāḥ* II, 1076, 8–9 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1076, 11–1077, 7; al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 17–18; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 942, 7–13. The possibility of *raf'* following *wa-* in this example, as *inḡitā'*, is discussed in appendix A, §4.1, towards the end.

³² A verse in the *wāfir* meter, probably by Diṭār b. Šaybān al-Namarī (for discussions of the possible identities of the poet, see, for example, al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 392, 8–12; Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 267b, 17; Ya'qūb, *Šawāhid* II, 1027).

³³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 21 = Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* (*Būlāq*) I, 426, 11.

³⁴ See, for example, al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 394 (verse 608) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 426; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 718, 9–13; al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 13–16 (cf. his commentators Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 942, 17–19; Ibn al-Ḥajīb, *Šarḥ* II, 26, 6–11); Ibn al-Ḥajīb, *'Amālī*

it is not clear beyond doubt that Sibawayhi in fact means this verse to serve as an example of *naṣb*; he adds no commentary on it, and there are reasons to suppose that he actually records this verse with the verb in *rafʿ* (*waʿadʿu*) in order to exemplify *inqiṭāʿ*.³⁵

3.1.5. *Wa-* meaning ‘and’ which joins a nominal element to an imperfect verb
This sentence type differs from the preceding ones in that *wa-* here is a regular conjunction which retains its regular meaning of ‘and’. It connects a nominal element and an imperfect verb, and since these are two disparate elements, this imperfect verb is *manṣūb*. Sibawayhi treats this sentence type towards the end of the chapter 242 on *wa-*, and a similar discussion is found in chapter 243, devoted to *ʿaw*. For an explanation of this ‘*atf*’adjunction’, according to Sibawayhi, as well as an example of this sentence type, see appendix A, §2.1.

3.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

In his commentary on Qurʾān 3:142 (quoted and translated above in §3.1.1-c) al-Farrāʾ discusses *ṣarf* and explains that *naṣb* in the verb following a conjunction can follow only a negation or a question.³⁶ However, with respect to *wa-* he also mentions sentences that are introduced by a prohibition (see §3.2.3). On the other hand, in his *Maʿānī* there are no

II, 864, 5–9 (part of ‘*imlāʾ*’ 188); al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 392–393; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ ṣawāhid* (1904), 280, 18–20.

³⁵ Both *naṣb* and *rafʿ* are possible according to the meter. The arguments in favor of the view that Sibawayhi quotes the verse with the latter are: (1) the context in which he records this verse: examples in which the verb following *wa-* is *marfūʿ* due to *inqiṭāʿ* (see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 18–20); (2) this is explicitly said and explained by one of his commentators; see al-Nahḥās, *Šarḥ*, 162, 1–3. The meaning of the verse with the version in *rafʿ* is ‘and I said: call and I will call (whether you call or not)...’.

There is also a third version, viz. with *waʿadʿu*, which is explained as a *majzūm* form. To keep the meter intact the first hemistich occurs with a slight change in the word following this verb: *faqltu dī waʿadʿu faʿinna ʿandā* (my emphasis). Early and later grammarians, starting from al-Farrāʾ, record this verse with *waʿadʿu* and explain that the speaker’s intention is *waʿadʿu* (i.e. with *lām al-ʿamr*), so that the meaning is ‘and I said: call and let me call...’. Al-Farrāʾ says that the meaning of the verse is similar to that of the conditional clause ‘*in daʿawti daʿawtu*’ ‘if you call, I will call’, although the verbs preceding and following *wa-* both express a command, judging from their form. See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 160, 4–7; II, 314, –7–3; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Cairo)* I, 92, 2 last lines; al-Fārisī, *ʿġfāl* I, 64, 3–4; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 391, –2–392, 2; Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Ḍarāʿir*, 150, 2 last lines. In addition al-Šantamarī, Ibn Yaʿīš, al-ʿAynī and al-Suyūṭī, who record this verse with the version *waʿadʿuwa* in *naṣb*, mention that the version in *jazm* exists, too (for references see note 34 above; cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 695, 8–10, where the author records only the version in *jazm*).

³⁶ See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī* I, 235, 16–17. This excerpt is quoted and translated in the definition of *ṣarf* in appendix A, §13.

examples of sentences in which the utterance preceding *wa-* is a command (cf. Sībawayhi's examples in §3.1.4 above). But the lack of such examples in the *Ma'ānī* does not necessarily mean that al-Farrā' excludes it in the context of *wa-*; rather, it probably merely reflects the absence of such sentences in the Qur'ān. In the following sections I present and discuss al-Farrā's examples of each sentence type, taken from the spoken language of the Bedouins, the Qur'ān and ancient poetry.

3.2.1. *The utterance preceding wa- is negative*

- a. Qur'ān 3:142 mentioned above. Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, mentions the two possible moods, *naṣb* and *jazm*, in the verb following *wa-* (cf. §3.1.1-c). The main difference between the two grammarians lies in their views on what induces *naṣb* in this case: an *'an muḍmara* according to Sībawayhi and *ṣarf* according to al-Farrā'.³⁷
- b. *Lam 'ātihi wa'ukrimahu 'illā staxaffa bī* 'I did not come to him and [at the same time] honored him without him disregarding me'.³⁸
- c. *Lā yasa'unī ṣay'un wayaḍīqa 'anka* (for a translation see §3.1.1-a, where an almost identical sentence from Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* is discussed). Al-Farrā' explains that the negation particle *lā* does not affect the verb following *wa-* (but only the preceding one) and the *naṣb* is therefore explained as due to *ṣarf*.³⁹

3.2.2. *The utterance preceding wa- is a question, wish or desire*

- a. *Lima taqūmu wataq'uda yā rajulu* 'why do you stand and [at the same time] turn to sit,⁴⁰ O man?'.⁴¹

³⁷ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 235, 14–236, 3.

³⁸ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 235, 14–15. This example is recorded in al-Farrā's commentary on Qur'ān 3:142 mentioned above.

³⁹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 236, 2–3. This example, like the previous one, is recorded in al-Farrā's commentary on Qur'ān 3:142 mentioned above. See also *ibid.* II, 71, 6–8, where the sentence is explained again.

⁴⁰ The translation 'turn to sit' seems better than 'sit', because the latter would result in illogical meaning: 'why do you stand and [at the same time] sit?'. It is possible that *taqūmu wataq'uda* in this example are related to the expression *qāma waqa'ada* which means, according to Lane, *Lexicon* VII, 2544c, –14ff. 'he experienced griefs which disquieted him so that he could not remain at rest, but stood up and sat down'.

⁴¹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 221, 2 last lines. This example is recorded in al-Farrā's commentary on Qur'ān 3:71, which is discussed and translated in c. below.

- b. Qur'ān 6:27. Al-Farrā', like Sibawayhi, mentions the two possibilities of *raf'* and *naṣb* in the verb following *wa-* and prefers the former (the verse is quoted and translated in §3.1.2-b).⁴²
- c. *Lima talbisūna l-ḥaqqā bil-bāṭili wataktumūna l-ḥaqqā wa'antum ta'lamūna* 'why do you confound the truth with vanity and conceal the truth wittingly?' (Qur'ān 3:71). In this verse the utterance preceding *wa-* is a question, but the following verb is *marfū'*, due to *iṣrāk* between the verbs preceding and following *wa-*. Al-Farrā' says that the verb following *wa-* could have been *manṣūb* due to *ṣarf*.⁴³ In that case the translation would be 'why do you confound the truth with vanity and [at the same time] conceal the truth wittingly?'.
- d. *'Alam nastaḥwid 'alaykum wanamna'kum mina l-mu'minīna* 'did we not gain the mastery over you and [did we not] defend you from the believers?' (Qur'ān 4:141). This verse is structurally similar to Qur'ān 3:71 mentioned above, with *iṣrāk* between the verbs preceding and following *wa-*, both in the *jazm* mood. Here, too, al-Farrā' mentions the possibility of *naṣb* following *wa-* and explains it as due to *ṣarf*.⁴⁴ In that case the translation would be 'did we not gain the mastery over you and [at the same time] defend you from the believers?'.

3.2.3. The utterance preceding *wa-* is a prohibition

All examples in this section are introduced by the *lā* of prohibition. The first four are Qur'ānic verses in which the verbs following *wa-* are in the plural form and can thus be taken as *majzūm* or *manṣūb*. Al-Farrā' explains the former as due to the *lā* of prohibition which applies to both verbs preceding and following *wa-*, whereas the latter is explained as due to *ṣarf*. In the translations below the latter possibility has been chosen.

- a. Qur'ān 2:42.⁴⁵ Cf. §3.1.3-c.
- b. *Walā ta'kulū 'amwālakum baynakum bil-bāṭili watudlū bihā 'ilā l-ḥukkāmī* 'and do not consume your goods between you in vanity and [at the same time] offer it as bribe to the judges!' (Qur'ān 2:188).⁴⁶

⁴² See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 276, 12–15. It seems that al-Farrā' considers the preferred reading of the verb following *wa-* with *raf'* as stemming from the fact that in this case *wa-* introduces a new utterance (what al-Farrā' and Sibawayhi call *isti'nāf* and *inqiṭā'*, respectively). Ibn al-Sarrāj explicitly says that this is al-Farrā's opinion with respect to this verse. See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 185, 1–2.

⁴³ For a reference see note 41 above.

⁴⁴ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 292, 8–13.

⁴⁵ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 33, 11–34, 15.

⁴⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 33, 11–15; 115, 3–4. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *Ṭrāb* I, 290, 7–10.

- c. *Yā 'ayyuhā llaḏīna 'āmanū lā taxūnū llāha warasūlahu wataxūnū 'amānātikum wa'antum ta'lamūna* 'O those who believe, do not betray God and his messenger and [at the same time] betray your trusts wittingly!' (Qur'ān 8:27).⁴⁷
- d. *Falā tahīnū watad'ū 'ilā l-salmi* 'and do not be weak and [at the same time] call for peace!' (Qur'ān 47:35).⁴⁸
- e. *Lā tanha 'an xuluqin wata'tiya miṭlahu / 'ārun 'alayka 'idā fa'alta 'aẓīmu*.⁴⁹
Cf. §3.1.3-b.
- f. *Lā tasriq wataṣaddaqa* 'do not steal and [at the same time] give alms!'.⁵⁰

3.3. Other grammarians

Grammarians usually repeat Sibawayhi's sentence types, but the list may differ from one grammarian to another, as exemplified in the sections below. The names which grammarians use in order to describe the sentence types are identical to those they use when discussing *fa*-. Many grammarians explicitly say that *fa*- and *wa*- are identical as far as these sentence types are concerned;⁵¹ cf. chapter 6, §3.3 and §3.3.1. Ibn Mālik and some later grammarians mention only two sentence types: *nafy* and *talab*;⁵² cf. chapter 6, §3.3.2.

Abū Ḥayyān states that he does not remember having encountered any examples in which the verb following *wa*- is *manṣūb* when the preceding utterance consists of '*arḍ, du'ā, taḥḏīd* or *tarajjī*'. He concludes that in the absence of evidence from actual heard utterances, such sentences are probably not possible, but then gives four hypothetical examples of such sentences.⁵³

⁴⁷ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 33, 11–16; 408, 2–3.

⁴⁸ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* III, 64, 1.

⁴⁹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 34, 2–5 (cf. al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 413, –2–414, 3, where al-Farrā' is quoted anonymously and with some errors). See also al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 115, 7–9, where the author quotes the verse again and argues that *jazm* following *wa*- would be possible if the *lā* of prohibition applied also to the verb following *wa*-.

⁵⁰ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 115, 4–7. This example is recorded in al-Farrā's commentary on Qur'ān 2:188 mentioned in b. above.

⁵¹ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 221, –2–222, 1; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 26, 7–9; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 154, 10; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 80, 1; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) X, 6623b, 3–6; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 363, 17ff.; Ibn al-Ḥājib, *Kāfiya* (1998) IV, 63, 3–5; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 157, 12–13; al-Mālaqī, *Rasf*, 422, 6–11; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 156, –3–2.

⁵² See, for example, Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 36, 4ff.; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 484, 15ff.

⁵³ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1680, 1–4 (cf. partial quotations in Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ* II, 947, 4–6; al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāḥ* (1998) II, 505, 3–5; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham* IV, 128, 8–11). See also Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḏūr*, 279, 2–3, where the author mentions '*arḍ, du'ā*' and *taḥḏīd* as sentence

3.3.1. *Wa-* meaning ‘and’ which joins a nominal element to an imperfect verb

Most grammarians explain this sentence type like Sībawayhi (see §3.1.5 and also appendix A, §2.3).⁵⁴

4. THE MEANING OF *WA-* FOLLOWED BY A *MANṢŪB* VERB

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

As mentioned in §2.1, Sībawayhi begins his discussion of *wa-* with the statement that it is syntactically like *fa-* but differs from it semantically. A perusal of his examples of *naṣb* following *wa-* shows that in all but one the actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following this conjunction are to be understood as occurring simultaneously.⁵⁵

In the following paragraphs I present Sībawayhi’s views on the meaning of *wa-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb and the different meanings of *wa-* and *fa-* followed by *naṣb*:

- a. In reference to the first line of poetry he quotes (see §3.1.3-b), Sībawayhi states that the meanings of *naṣb* following *wa-* and *fa-* differ. He explains that the meaning of *naṣb* in the above-mentioned verse (which is introduced by the *lā* of prohibition) is that the two actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *wa-* should not occur together.⁵⁶ It seems to me that he means a simultaneous occurrence, and as Jahn notes,⁵⁷ this meaning differs from that of a *manṣūb* verb following *fa-*, which denotes a result of the action expressed in the preceding utterance.
- b. In order to convince the reader that *fa-* and *wa-* denote different meanings when followed by *manṣūb* verbs, Sībawayhi shows that they also differ when they connect two nouns: *marartu biZaydin wa‘Amrin* and *marartu biZaydin fa‘Amrin* both mean ‘I passed by Zayd and ‘Amr’, but in the former it is not clear whom I passed by first,⁵⁸ whereas in the latter it is clear that I first passed by Zayd and subsequently by ‘Amr.⁵⁹

types for which there is no evidence from the spoken language of the Bedouins for *naṣb* following *wa-* (cf. Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 376, 9–377, 4; Ba‘albaki, *Wāw*, 11, –11–6).

⁵⁴ For a thorough discussion of this sentence type, in which *wa-* connects a nominal element and an imperfect verb and means ‘and’, see al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 422, 13–424, 11.

⁵⁵ The exceptional example is *i’tinī wa‘ātiyaka* which is discussed in §3.1.4-a; see especially note 30 there.

⁵⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 14–16.

⁵⁷ See Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 90, beginning of note 3 of chapter 242.

⁵⁸ Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 159, 1–2.

⁵⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 17–18.

- c. In reference to *lā ta'kuli l-samaka watašraba l-labna* (for translation and discussion see §3.1.3-a), Sibawayhi says *falaw 'adxalta l-fā'a hāhunā fasada l-ma'nā* 'had you inserted *fa-* [instead of *wa-*], the meaning [of the sentence] would have been corrupted'.⁶⁰ He subsequently explains that the above-mentioned sentence means *lā tajma' bayna l-labni wal-samaki* 'do not join [drinking] milk to [eating] fish!' and the speaker's intention is not to prohibit drinking milk *per se*⁶¹ or eating fish *per se*.⁶²
- d. In reference to *'alam 'aku jārakum watakūna baynī / wabaynakumu l-mawaddatu wal-'ixā'u* (for translation and discussion see §3.1.2-a), Sibawayhi says that the meaning of *našb* following *wa-* is similar to that of a circumstantial clause.⁶³
- e. Sibawayhi says that sentences such as *da'nī walā 'a'ūdu* and *zurnī wa'azūruka*, in which the verb following *wa-* takes *raf'* due to *inqiṭā'* (these examples are discussed in appendix A, §4.1), do not convey the meaning of joining the two actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *wa-*.⁶⁴

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' agrees with Sibawayhi on the meaning of *našb* following *wa-*. In reference to Qur'an 2:188 which is introduced by the *lā* of prohibition (the verse is quoted and translated in §3.2.3-b), al-Farrā' says that the meaning of *našb* is *lā tajma' bayna hādayni kaḍā wakaḍā* 'do not join these two (i.e. the actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *wa-*) so-and-so'.⁶⁵ In his commentaries on Qur'an 4:141 and 7:127, al-Farrā' explains that *našb* following *wa-* conveys a meaning similar to that of a circumstantial clause.⁶⁶

4.3. *Other grammarians*

Many grammarians refer to the meaning of *wa-* followed by *našb*; some state that it differs from that of *fa-* in a similar syntactic environment.⁶⁷

⁶⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 18–19. Cf. §4.3.3.1.

⁶¹ This is how I translate *'alā ḥidatin*. Jahn uses *für sich*. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 159, 14–15.

⁶² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 22–379, 2. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 716, 4 last lines.

⁶³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 2–5.

⁶⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 15–17 and 379, 18–20, respectively. Cf. al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufašṣal*, 11, 13–16; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 942, 14–15.

⁶⁵ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 115, 4–7.

⁶⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 292, 8–10; 391, 10–11.

⁶⁷ See, for example, al-Xwārazmī, *Mafātīḥ*, 63, 2 last lines.

In line with Sībawayhi and al-Farrā', the two main meanings which most grammarians attribute to *naṣb* following *wa-* are of *jam'*/*ijtimā'* 'joining' and a circumstantial clause.

4.3.1. *The meaning jam'/ijtimā'*

Many grammarians follow Sībawayhi and al-Farrā' and maintain that the meaning of *wa-* followed by *naṣb* is of *jam'*/*ijtimā'*, viz. joining the action denoted by the verb in the utterance preceding *wa-* to the action denoted by the verb in the following utterance.⁶⁸ Some refer to *jam' bayna l-ṣay'ayni* 'joining the two utterances' and exemplify this notion with the above-mentioned sentence *lā ta'kuli l-samaka watašraba l-labna* which means *lā yakūnu minka jam'un bayna hādāyni* 'there will be from your side no joining of these two'.⁶⁹ Others, like Ibn al-Sarrāj and al-Sirāfi, mention the meaning of *ijtimā'* (a synonym of *jam'* in this context).⁷⁰ The former subsequently says that the only meaning of *wa-* followed by a *manšūb* verb is *ma'a* 'with'.⁷¹ Later grammarians, who also mention the meaning of *ma'a* in this context, explain that this is exactly the same meaning that *wa-* denotes when followed by a noun in the *naṣb* case, viz. *al-maf'ūl ma'ahu*.^{72, 73}

4.3.2. *The meaning of a circumstantial clause*

Like Sībawayhi and al-Farrā', some grammarians contend that the meaning of *wa-* followed by a *manšūb* verb is similar to that of a circumstantial clause.⁷⁴ However, more grammarians subscribe to the view discussed in the previous section. Al-Sirāfi and al-'Ukbarī seem to attribute the

⁶⁸ See, for example, al-Zajjāj, *Ma'āni* (1994) I, 428, -2.

⁶⁹ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 25, 6-7; 26, 7; al-Fārisī, *Ta'līq* II, 160, -1; 161, 7-9; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 148, 1-5 (part of *mas'ala* 157); al-Fārisī, *Idāh* II, 1070, 11 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1071, 1-13; 1072, 7; 1072, 13-1073, 5; 1074, 9-15; al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 7-9; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 153, 2-16; al-Warrāq, *Ilal*, 277, 5-7.

⁷⁰ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 151, 4; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 426.

⁷¹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 154, 13-15; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 80, 2-3.

⁷² The literal meaning of this term is 'that with whom the action [expressed in the verb] is done'. It refers to a noun in adverbial use and in the accusative case, following the conjunction *wa-* meaning *ma'a* 'with'. See, for example, Wright, *Grammar* II, 83-84, §37.

⁷³ See al-Baṭalyawsi, *Islāh*, 255, 7-11; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* III, 224, 7-9; Ibn Mālik, *Alfiyya*, 161, 10 (Arabic text) and 160-162 (the editor's remarks); Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 232, 4; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 38, 8-15; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1683, 10-12; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 95, 4-5; al-Makkūdī, *Šarḥ* II, 698, 6 last lines.

⁷⁴ See Ibn Ṣuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 42 (all page); al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 425 (cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 717, 7-9; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 435, 7-11); al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 41, 1-8; al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 395.

same possible meaning to both *naṣb* and *rafʿ* following *wa-*, viz. that of a circumstantial clause.⁷⁵

4.3.3. *The meaning of jawāb*

Al-ʿUkbarī mentions that some grammarians contend (*yuqālu* ‘it is said’) that the meaning of *wa-* followed by *naṣb* is that of *jawāb* (i.e. identical to that of *fā-* in the same syntactic environment). They argue that the meaning of *lā taʿkuli l-samaka wataṣraba l-labna* (discussed in §3.1.3-a, §4.1-c and §4.3.1) is *ʾidā ʾakalta l-samaka falā taṣrabi l-labna waʾin šaribta l-labna falā taʿkuli l-samaka* ‘if you eat fish, do not drink milk! And if you drink milk, do not eat fish!’.⁷⁶ This unusual view is also reflected in the terminology of grammarians who use the term *jawāb* in order to denote the utterance in which *wa-* is followed by a *manṣūb* verb.⁷⁷

4.3.3.1. *Criticism of the view which attributes such a meaning to wa-* Al-Baṭalyawsī criticizes the use of the term *jawāb* with respect to *naṣb* following *wa-* (see the end of the previous section), as a *taʿaqqub* ‘fault’.⁷⁸ Abū Ḥayyān argues that this use is *ʾalā jihati l-majāzi lā ʾalā jihati l-ḥaqīqati* ‘not in its proper or original sense, not according to its original application’.⁷⁹ He also shows that *wa-* and *fā-* followed by *naṣb* do not have the same meaning, since *wa-* cannot replace *fā-* in *lā tadnu mina l-ʾasadi fayaʿkulaka* (this sentence is thoroughly discussed in chapter 6, §5.1 and also §2.3.1-a), nor can *fā-* replace *wa-* in the above-mentioned sentence *lā taʿkuli l-samaka wataṣraba l-labna*.⁸¹

⁷⁵ It is possible that the similar meaning which the two moods allegedly convey is related to a theory entertained by later grammarians, that they are interchangeable following *wa-* in particular and other conjunctions in general. This theory is discussed at length in chapter 11.

⁷⁶ See al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 42, –1–43, 2. Cf. Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʾid* III, 95, 9–12, where the author attributes this opinion to *baʿḍ al-naḥwīyyīna* ‘one, or some, of the grammarians’.

⁷⁷ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 22, 7; al-Warrāq, *ʾIlal*, 277, 3ff.

⁷⁸ See al-Baṭalyawsī, *Šarḥ*, 254, 7–255, 11.

⁷⁹ This translation is taken from Lane, *Lexicon* II, 609b, 8–14, where the meaning of *ḥaqīqa* is explained and *majāz* is mentioned as its antonym.

⁸⁰ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1683, 10–12 (cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 129, 1–3, where Abū Ḥayyān is quoted). See also Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʾid* III, 95, 5–9.

⁸¹ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1677, 4–7. See also Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʾid* III, 93, 2–5; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 128, 12–129, 3. With respect to the second example, see especially §4.1-c.

4.4. *Secondary sources*

Most modern scholars are of the opinion that *wa-* followed by *naṣb* implies simultaneous occurrences.⁸² De Sacy and other scholars argue that *wa-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb may occur in the sense of *fa-* in the same syntactic environment (cf. §4.3.3 above).⁸³ Fleischer criticizes de Sacy's theory in strong terms and emphasizes that the meaning of *wa-* followed by *naṣb* is not like that of *fa-* but rather like that of *ma'a 'an*.⁸⁴

The view that *wa-* might in fact have the same meaning as *fa-* is also held by Ba'albakī, who presents it in an article and summarizes it in one of his books.⁸⁵ In the article he presents the common opinion among grammarians with respect to *wa-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb, viz. that it implies simultaneous occurrences, but then contends that *wa-* in fact does not always convey this meaning but may actually denote exactly what *fa-* denotes when also followed by *naṣb*: a result of the preceding clause.⁸⁶ This meaning, he argues, fits two lines of poetry and one Qur'ānic verse (all quoted already by Sibawayhi and discussed in this book) much better: (1) *lalubsu 'abā'atin wataqarra 'aynī / 'aḥabbu 'ilayya min lubsi l-ṣufūfi* (for translation and discussion see appendix A, §2.1-c); (2) *'alam 'aku jārakum watakūna baynī / wabaynakumu l-mawaddatu wal-'ixā'u* (see §3.1.2-a); (3) Qur'an 6:27 (see §3.1.2-b). On the other hand, he contends, there are three examples, all from poetry, in which it is clear that *wa-* does convey simultaneous occurrences. The first is *lā tanha 'an xuluqin wata'tiya miṭlahu / 'ārun 'alayka 'idā fa'alta 'aẓīmu* (see §3.1.3-b) and the other two are quoted by Sibawayhi and succeeding grammarians who mention that the associated verb can take either *naṣb* or *raf'*. Since all three verses also have versions in which the verb is in *raf'*,⁸⁷ Ba'albakī hypothesizes that

⁸² See Erpenius, *Grammar*, 62, 17; Michaelis, *Grammatik*, 142–143, §9; Ewald, *Grammar*, 119 (end of §628); de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 556, §1212; Trumpp, *Einleitung*, 39, 13–17; Wright, *Grammar* II, 32 (beginning of §15(e)); Howell, *Grammar* II, 32, 13–15; Vernier, *Grammaire* I, 500, §533.4; II, 503 (beginning of §1050); Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 462 (beginning of §231); Fleischer, *Arabe*, 221, note 1; Fleisch, *Philologie* II, 493, note 2 of §152; Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 375.

⁸³ See de Sacy, *Grammaire* II, 27, §57, where the author claims that *wa-* may occur not only in the sense of *fa-* but also in that of *ḥattā*; Vernier, *Grammaire* I, 500 (end of §533.4); Gaudefroy-Demombynes-Blachère, *Grammaire*, 444, §440.

⁸⁴ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 535, –4–536, 7.

⁸⁵ See Ba'albakī, *Wāw*; Ba'albakī, *Dirāsāt*, 245–247.

⁸⁶ Although this opinion has some trace among grammarians and modern scholars (see §4.3.3 and the beginning of this section), Ba'albakī refers to neither.

⁸⁷ For the first see the references in note 74. For the second and third see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 2–7. Cf. Ba'albakī, *Wāw*, 10–11 and especially 11, 9–14.

naṣb reflects the meaning of a result of the preceding clause (exactly like *fa-*), whereas *rafʿ* implies simultaneous occurrences.

Baʿalbakī's theory is interesting and possible, because the typical meaning of *fa-* does indeed fit some examples in which *wa-* is followed by *naṣb*. There are however a number of considerations which cast doubt on its validity. To begin with, the *wa-* in Baʿalbakī's first example (number (1) above) is not *wāw al-maʿīyya* at all but rather *wāw al-ʿatf*, by which a noun and a verb are connected and the latter is thus *manṣūb*.⁸⁸ Secondly, Baʿalbakī attempts to relate the *rafʿ* mood following *wa-* to the meaning of a simultaneous occurrence based on three examples in which the associated verb is transmitted in two versions, viz. *naṣb* and *rafʿ*. Nevertheless, in two of the three examples which he quotes as evidence for the meaning of a result which *fa-* denotes, there is also evidence for both moods in the associated verb.⁸⁹ Thirdly, as Baʿalbakī himself states, according to the prevalent opinion among grammarians, *wa-* followed by *naṣb* implies simultaneous occurrences, contrary to *fa-*. In fact, no grammarian supports his contention, only two mention it as exceptional and others criticize it (see §4.3.3 and §4.3.3.1). Of course, this consensus cannot refute Baʿalbakī's counter-theory, but it is difficult to ignore the grammarians' arguments, especially Sībawayhi's, on the differences between *wa-* and *fa-* in this context and others (see, for example, §4.1-b).

5. SENTENCE TYPES IN WHICH A *MANṢŪB* VERB CANNOT FOLLOW *WA-*

5.1. *Sībawayhi*

In the chapter devoted to *wa-* Sībawayhi does not refer to this issue. In chapter 241, however, which is devoted to *fa-*, Sībawayhi quotes a line of poetry in which *wa-* is followed by *rafʿ*, since the preceding utterance

⁸⁸ Cf. note 1 above.

⁸⁹ For the line of poetry quoted in number (1) above, see al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1904), 225, 16–17 (cf. al-ʿAynī, *Maqāsid* IV, 398, –12–2). As for Qurʾān 6:27 (number (3) above), many grammarians, including Sībawayhi and al-Farrāʾ, state that the verbs following *wa-* can be in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*. In fact, most grammarians, from the time of al-Farrāʾ on, argue that *rafʿ* is preferable; even Sībawayhi explains *rafʿ* at length while *naṣb* is only briefly mentioned. For Sībawayhi and al-Farrāʾ see the references in notes 25 and 42, respectively. For other grammarians see al-Axḫāṣ, *Maʾānī* (1985) II, 487, 1–8; al-Zajjāj, *Maʾānī* (1994) II, 239, 12–240, 3; al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* II, 61, –1–62, 5; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Būlāq)* I, 426; al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 90, note 9 of chapter 242; al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 162, 5–16; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 149, 1–9 (*masʿala* 159); Ibn Jinnī, *Muḥtasab* I, 192, –2–193, 2; al-Baṭalyawsi, *ʿIṣlāḥ*, 255, iff.; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 932, 20–933, 4.

is *wājib*, i.e. an indicative sentence denoting certainty.⁹⁰ The discussion of this verse begins Sībawayhi's treatment of sentence types in which *fa*- cannot be followed by *našb* but only by *raf*^c, because the preceding utterance is *wājib* (see chapter 6, §4.1). Sībawayhi's reference to this verse with *wa*- in the chapter devoted to *fa*- is a clear sign that these conjunctions are for him alike, as far as the syntactic environments which require *našb* or *raf*^c are concerned (cf. §2.1 above). The verb following both conjunctions can thus take only *raf*^c, when the preceding utterance is an indicative sentence denoting certainty.

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, does not explicitly comment on this subject. A perusal of his references to *wa*- followed by *našb* shows, however, that he agrees with Sībawayhi: *našb* is not possible when the utterance preceding *wa*- is *wājib*. Cf. chapter 6, §4.2.

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians, like Sībawayhi and al-Farrā', do not discuss sentence types in which a *manšūb* verb cannot follow *wa*-. Ibn al-Sarrāj, towards the end of the chapter devoted to this conjunction, briefly notes that *našb* following *wa*- and *fa*- is only possible when the preceding utterance is not *wājib*.⁹¹ This seems to be the prevalent opinion among grammarians. Cf. chapter 6, §4.3.1.

6. WHAT INDUCES THE VERB FOLLOWING *WA*- TO BE *MANŠŪB*?

Since grammarians' opinions on what induces the verb following *wa*- to take *našb* are very similar to their views on the parallel question with respect to 'aw (see chapter 5, §4), only explicit statements on *wa*- are presented below.

6.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi's view is that the mood of the verb following *wa*- is due to an 'an *muḍmara*. This can be inferred from two explicit statements: (1) In

⁹⁰ For this verse see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 20–377, 2. Cf. Reuschel, *al-Xalīl*, 26, –1–27, 3; Ba'albakī, *Wāw*, 12.

⁹¹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, 'Uṣūl (1996) II, 155, 10–11.

reference to the line of poetry *lā tanha 'an xuluqin wata'tiya miṭlahu / 'ārun 'alayka 'idā fa'alta 'aẓīmu* (see §3.1.3-b), Sibawayhi contends that the *manṣūb* verb *ta'tiya* following *wa-* takes its mood due to an *'an muḍmara*;⁹² (2) the *taqdīr* structure by which Sibawayhi explains the sentence *i'tinī wa'ātiyaka* shows that an *'an muḍmara* induces the *naṣb* mood (see §3.1.4-a and note 30 for a reference).

6.2. *Al-Farrā'*

According to al-Farrā' the *naṣb* mood following *wa-* is due to *ṣarf*. He defines and discusses this term in his commentaries on Qur'ān 2:42 and 3:142. For an explanation of this principle, see appendix A, §13.

6.3. *Other grammarians*

6.3.1. *The verb following wa- is manṣūb due to 'an muḍmara*

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that an *'an muḍmara* induces the *naṣb* mood of the verb following *wa-*⁹³ and some also make the *taqdīr* structure explicit.⁹⁴

The grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that *'an* following *wa-* in the literal utterance is impermissible.⁹⁵ Some add that this case is the same as the impermissibility of *'an* following *lām al-juḥūd* and other particles (for *lām al-juḥūd* see chapter 9, §3 and §9).⁹⁶ Ibn al-Sarrāj states that an overt *'an* cannot appear after *wa-* when the latter conveys a meaning of *ijtimā'* (for this meaning see §4.3.1).⁹⁷ By this he means that only when *wa-* conveys this special meaning should *'an* not be pronounced in the literal utterance, but when *wa-* connects a verb and a noun, and this verb

⁹² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 16–17.

⁹³ See, for example, al-Aḫfaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 221, 1–2; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 7, 1; 26, 7; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 91, 11–12; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 62, 4–5; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 51, 18; Ibn Fāris, *Šāhibī*, 118, 10–13; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 716, 6–7; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 109, 1–110, 1; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 206, 2 last lines.

⁹⁴ See, for example, al-Aḫfaṣ, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 222, 3–7; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 25, 11; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 154, 11–12; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 147, 6–10 (part of *mas'ala* 157); Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 350, 10–16; al-Šarīf al-Kūfi, *Šarḥ*, 434, 11–14; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 366, 12–13; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 932, 3–10; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 157, 9–12; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 36, 4–7. For an especially detailed explanation, see al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1071, 1–13; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 153, 6–16.

⁹⁵ See, for example, al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 82, 10–12.

⁹⁶ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 55, 7–9; al-Fārisī, *Iqfāl* I, 65, 2–3; Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'is* (1990) I, 264, 6–265, 1; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 167, 12; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 9.

⁹⁷ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 151, 4. Cf. Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 296, 2 last lines, where the author uses the term *muṣāḥaba*, which is common among later grammarians.

is thus *manṣūb*, *wa-* preserves its regular meaning as a conjunction and *'an* may optionally be used (see appendix A, §2).⁹⁸

6.3.2. *The verb following wa- is manṣūb due to ṣarf*

The view that the verb following *wa-* is *manṣūb* due to *ṣarf* is attributed to al-Farrā' in particular and to the Kūfans in general.⁹⁹

6.3.3. *The verb following wa- is manṣūb due to the influence of wa- itself*

This opinion is attributed to the Baṣran grammarian al-Jarmī, and some attribute it to al-Kisā'ī as well. For references see chapter 5, §4.3.3 and chapter 6, §7.3.3.

6.3.4. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans on the 'āmil which induces naṣb following wa-*

Ibn al-Anbārī discusses this question in his *'Inṣāf*.¹⁰⁰ The opinions he presents correspond to the three opinions mentioned in §§6.3.1–6.3.3 above.

7. CONCLUSION

The mood of the imperfect verb following *wa-* has received considerably less attention than the mood of the verb following *fa-*. This difference may well be due to the scarcity of examples of *wa-* followed by *naṣb* from the living language¹⁰¹ and the great similarity between the syntactic environments in which the conjunctions *wa-* and *fa-* can be followed by a *manṣūb* verb; this similarity seems to save the grammarians, after their detailed discussions of *fa-*, the need to repeat the theoretical discussion that accounts for the mood of the verb following *wa-*. The grammarians' discussions of *wa-* concern mainly its meaning when it is followed by *naṣb* and the question of what induces the following verb to take this mood. Grammarians also treat the sentence types in which it can be followed by *naṣb* (as well as those in which *naṣb* is impossible, though to a lesser extent).

⁹⁸ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 149, –2–150, 5. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Īdāh* II, 1058, 2–3 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1058, 7–15; 1060, 8–9; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 434, 14–435, 3; Ibn Barrī, *Šarḥ*, 250–251; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 932, 10–18; al-Murādi, *Janā*, 157, –2–158, 1. See also Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 206, –1–207, 5.

⁹⁹ See, for example, al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 40, 9.

¹⁰⁰ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inṣāf*, 229–230 (*mas'ala* 75).

¹⁰¹ Cf. Abū Ḥayyān's note at the end of §3.3 and note 53 there.

According to Sībawayhi and most succeeding grammarians, a *manṣūb* verb following *wa-* occurs in the same syntactic environments in which such a verb follows *fa-*, viz. when the preceding utterance is not an indicative sentence denoting certainty. When it *is* such a sentence, *naṣb* following *wa-* is not expected. As shown in §4.1, all of Sībawayhi's examples of *naṣb* following *wa-* but one show that it conveys a simultaneous occurrence of the actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *wa-*. Most grammarians, including al-Farrā', emphasize that this is the meaning of *wa-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb, but there are other opinions, too (see §§4.3–4.4). As for the question of what induces *naṣb* following *wa-*, Sībawayhi's opinion, which most succeeding grammarians hold, is that this mood is due to an *'an muḍmara*. Al-Farrā', on the other hand, explains this *naṣb* as due to *ṣarf*.

CHAPTER EIGHT

ḤATTĀ*

1. INTRODUCTION

Ḥattā is a preposition¹ which can be used in many syntactic and semantic contexts; it can be followed by a verb, in the perfect or the imperfect *manṣūb* or *marfūʿ*, or by a noun in the *jarr* case. The famous grammarian al-Farrāʾ expressed his frustration at the complexities of *ḥattā* in the following words: *ʾamūtu wafī nafsī min ḥattā šayʾun* 'I shall die, while in my soul there is something [obscure] regarding *ḥattā*'.²

This chapter is mainly devoted to the mood of the imperfect verb following *ḥattā*. Sībawayhi's and al-Farrāʾ's theories on the conditions for the occurrence of *naṣb* or *rafʿ* following *ḥattā* are among the more complex subjects discussed in this book.

1.1. Sībawayhi

Sībawayhi devotes chapters 238–240 in his *Kitāb* to *ḥattā* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 6–372, 14). In chapter 238 he elucidates the different usages of the imperfect verb following *ḥattā*, which he divides into four different sentence types, two in which the verb is *manṣūb*, and two in which it is *marfūʿ* (see §3.1). Chapter 239 is devoted to the discussion of the more complex structures involving *ḥattā* and some theories, such as that of *qalb* (see §5.1). Chapter 240 deals with sentences in which the agents of the verbs preceding and following *ḥattā* differ (see §6.1).

* An earlier version of a number of points discussed in this chapter appears in the article Sadan, *Ḥattā*.

¹ Most grammarians and lexicographers do not address the question of whether *ḥattā* is a preposition or a noun. Those who do so state that it is a preposition. See al-Azhārī, *Tahḏīb* III, 424a, –2–424b, 2; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣḥābī, *Istidrāk*, 4, 14; al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 119, 1–2; al-Jawharī, *Tāj* I, 115, 17; al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 131, 5–7; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 25, 5–6; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* I, 382, 2; al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 404, 1; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 243, 9; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 175, 6; Abū Ḥayyān, *Manhaj*, 242, 22; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Maʿānī*, 386, 2–3.

² See al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1987), 192a, 14–16. This sentence is also quoted by al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*, 395a, towards the end; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) III, 36a, 8–19; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* I, 341b, 16–18.

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' treats the usages of *ḥattā* followed by an imperfect verb in his commentary on Qur'ān 2:214, in which the associated verb can take either the *naṣb* or the *raf'* mood (see §3.2.2).³ It is noteworthy that this is not the first occurrence of *ḥattā* followed by an imperfect verb in the Qur'ān, but actually the ninth. I assume that al-Farrā''s decision to elaborate on his theory of *ḥattā* here is due to the different *qirā'āt* of the associated verb with *naṣb* and *raf'* in this verse.

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians treat *ḥattā* at length. Some discuss the mood of the following verb only in the chapters devoted to the imperfect verb and its moods, while others also treat it in chapters on *ḥurūf al-jarr*, since according to the Baṣran (and prevalent) view *ḥattā* is a *ḥarf jarr* (see note 1 above) and the *naṣb* mood of the following verb is due to an '*an muḍmara* (see §9).

1.4. *Secondary sources*

Modern scholars also discuss *ḥattā* at length. Recently, in fact, a whole book was written on Sibawayhi's and al-Farrā''s different views on this word (Ġazlān, *Ḥattā*) which, however, gives only a partial picture and contains several severe inaccuracies and misunderstandings.⁴ Wild's and Talmon's articles (Wild, *Ḥattā* and Talmon, *Ḥattā*) treat specific points in the theories on the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*, but they are limited in scope and also contain a number of errors.⁵

³ For the whole discussion see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 132–136.

⁴ Ġazlān aims at elucidating Sibawayhi's and al-Farrā''s theories on *ḥattā*. His book does not contain any references to other grammarians whose explanations can aid in understanding these two prominent grammarians' views. In addition, he fails to understand several crucial points in their texts. See, for example, end of note 29.

⁵ The main problem with Wild's article is that his examples date indiscriminately from different periods of the language, and takes no account of the fact that early grammarians' theories and rules may not apply to prose or poetry written centuries later. In addition, Wild has clearly misunderstood some grammarians' statements on this issue (see, for example, note 175 on sentences introduced by '*innamā*) and in other cases does not understand the interconnection between some of their statements and views (see §3.2.2 and especially note 53 on al-Ṭabarī commentary on Qur'ān 2:214 which is related to al-Farrā''s view on *ḥattā*). Wild is also rather skeptical concerning the examples of *ḥattā* provided by grammarians, most of which he believes were invented (see Wild, *Ḥattā*, 221, 5–6). It is unclear why he thinks so, since he provides no evidence for this claim. He thus engenders

2. THE MORPHOLOGICAL PATTERN OF ḤATTĀ AND THE POSSIBLE LINK TO THE ROOT ḤTT

2.1. *The Classical Arabic lexicons*

Some Classical Arabic lexicons have no entry at all for *ḥattā*.⁶ Most lexicons which do, list it under the root *ḥtt*.⁷ The verb which is derived from this root in the first form is *ḥatta* which means 'he scraped it, or rubbed it, off [...] namely, a thing, as, for instance, blood, or semen, or something dry, from a garment, or the like';⁸ its *maṣḍar* form is *ḥatt*.⁹

The meaning of *ḥattahu* 'ani l-ṣay'i (with an object following the preposition 'an) is 'he repelled him, drove him back, or turned him back, from the thing',¹⁰ a synonym of *raddahu*.¹¹ Another meaning of *ḥatt* which the lexicons mention is 'quickness'.¹²

Al-Azharī in his *Tahḍīb* states that a number of grammarians view *ḥattā* as a noun in the pattern of *fa'lā*, derived from *ḥatt* meaning 'ending something'.¹³ He rejects this view and contends that had *ḥattā* been in the pattern of *fa'lā* and derived from *ḥatt*, its pronunciation with 'imāla¹⁴

a sense of subjectivity, which is quite incompatible with his concluding remarks in which some of the grammarians' principles on *ḥattā* are reflected, although the author neither refers to them nor states that his statements are based on them (see especially Wild, *Ḥattā*, 221, §3 which applies to §7 in this chapter).

Talmon's article focuses on one point only, the *qalb* theory, and his arguments and conclusions seem to be dubious (see §5 and especially §§5.4–5.5).

⁶ Here are the references to the lexicons' definitions of entries of the root *ḥtt*, in which *ḥattā* is not mentioned: al-Xalil, 'Ayn III, 21; Ibn Fāris, *Mujmal* I, 220; al-Fayyūmī, *Miṣbāḥ* I, 120.

⁷ Al-Azharī exceptionally refers to *ḥattā* under the two roots *ḥtt* and *ḥty*. See al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* III, 423–424; V, 200, respectively.

⁸ See Lane, *Lexicon* II, 508b, s.v. *ḥattahu*.

⁹ *Al-Ḥattu farkuka ṣay'an 'an tawbin 'ḥatt* [means] your scraping something from a cloth'. See al-Xalil, 'Ayn III, 21. Cf. al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* III, 423, where the author quotes a similar definition on the authority of al-Layṭ; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) II, 23b, 7–8.

¹⁰ See Lane, *Lexicon* II, 508c, 11–14.

¹¹ See Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) II, 23b, 2.

¹² *Wal-ḥattu l-'ajalatu fi kulli ṣay'in 'ḥatt* [means] quickness in every thing'. See al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* III, 424a, 5–6; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) II, 22b, –9.

¹³ *Waḡāla ba'dhum ḥattā fa'lā minā l-ḥatti wahuwa l-farāḡu minā l-ṣay'i*. See al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* III, 424a, 15–16. Cf. Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) II, 23b, 2 last lines and al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) III, 36b, 9–10, where the authors quote al-Azharī.

¹⁴ According to Levin, 'Imāla, 74, 2–4, 'imāla is a term used by the medieval Arab grammarians, denoting the fronting and raising of the old Arabic *ā* towards *ī*, and of the old short *a* towards *i*'. See further EALL II, 311a, s.v. 'Imāla.

would have been possible (but this is not so). He thus concludes that *ḥattā* is a preposition and not a noun or a verb.¹⁵

2.2. Secondary sources

De Sacy is convinced that *ḥattā* is an adverbial noun of the pattern *faʿlā* which originally had no syntactic effect on nouns. In his view the noun following *ḥattā* takes *jarr* either due to the *ʾiḍāfa* connection between them or to the preposition *li-*, which should follow *ḥattā* but is omitted from the literal utterance.¹⁶ Fleischer criticizes de Sacy's view and contends that the syntactic influence of the preposition *ḥattā*, originally a *maṣṣūb* noun in the pattern of *faʿlā* derived from the verb *ḥatta*, is due to the *ʾiḍāfa* connection and not to an omitted preposition *li-*. Fleischer hypothesizes that the meaning of *an etwas stossen* 'to knock against or bump into something' which *ḥatta* has (see §2.1 above) changed to *Reichen bis zu etwas* 'an arrival to something' and then to *Erreichung eines Endpunktes* 'arriving at an ending point' (Arabic *ġāya*; see note 21). Accordingly, he concludes, *ḥattā* functions as a preposition, and induces the following noun, which denotes an ending point, to take *jarr*.¹⁷

Al-Sāmarrāʾī, unlike Fleischer, relates the meaning of an ending point to the other meanings of the verb *ḥatta*: to scrape something off and to end something (see §2.1 above). He states that *maʿnā l-ḥatti l-istiʿṣālu wal-ʾizālatu wal-xulūṣu ʾilā l-nihāyati ʾaḡi l-wuṣūlu ʾilā nihāyati l-ʾamri* 'the meaning of *ḥatt* (the *maṣḍar* form of the verb *ḥatta*) is to uproot, remove and arrive to the end, that is to the end of the matter'.¹⁸ Al-Sāmarrāʾī subsequently refutes al-Azharī's view described at the end of §2.1, because there is evidence for its pronunciation with *ʾimāla*.¹⁹ In line with Fleischer, al-Sāmarrāʾī contends that *ḥattā* is a noun in the pattern of *faʿlā* and derived from *ḥatta*.²⁰

¹⁵ See al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* III, 424a, -2-424b, 2. Cf. Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) II, 24a, 1-4; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) III, 36b, 10-13, where the authors quote al-Azharī. The modern scholar al-Sāmarrāʾī rejects al-Azharī's view (see §2.2 below).

¹⁶ See de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 480, §1060.

¹⁷ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 403, -7-404, 7.

¹⁸ See al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Maʿānī* III, 35, 13-14.

¹⁹ Cf. Levin, *Hillī*, 265, note 50.

²⁰ See al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Maʿānī* III, 35, -3-36, 4.

3. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING ḤATTĀ: NAŠB OR RAF^c3.1. *Sibawayhi*3.1.1. *The two sentence types in which the verb following ḥattā takes našb*

3.1.1.1. *Ḥattā in the sense of 'ilā 'an* In the first sentence type in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *našb* mood, *ḥattā* means 'ilā 'an 'until' and the following verb denotes the *ḡāya* (the ending point of the domain of the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā*).²¹ *Sibawayhi*'s example for this sentence type is *sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'I walked until the point of entering²² it',

²¹ According to Lane, VI, 2312a, 10–12, the meaning of *ḡāya* is 'the utmost, or extreme, extent, term, limit, point, or reach; or the extremity; of a thing'. According to Levin, *Prepositions*, 352, 8–17, *ḡāya* means 'the space between two points'. Ibn Ya'īs explains the term in the context of *ḥattā* in the following words: *wal-murādu bil-ḡāyati 'an yakūna mā qablahā minā l-fi'li muttaṣilan bihā ḥattā yaqa'a hādā l-fi'lu llaḏi ba'dahā fi muntahāhu* 'the intention in the [term] *ḡāya* is that the action of the verb preceding it occurs continuously until the occurrence of the action of the verb following it, in its ending point (i.e. the ending point of the action of the verb preceding it)'. See Ibn Ya'īs, *Šarḥ* II, 929, 2–3.

²² The examples in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *našb* mood should be translated using a gerund and not a conjugated verb (in this example: 'until the point of entering' and not 'until I have entered'). The reason is that a *manšūb* verb following *ḥattā* merely represents the idea that this verb is expected to occur, but its actual occurrence is not certain, that is, it may occur in reality but it may also not occur; see Ibn al-Ḥājjib's and al-Astarābādī's views in §§4.3.1–4.3.2 and §12.1. In Fleischer, *Schriften* II.1, 84, 10–15, the author criticizes Trumpp's translation of the sentence *sirtu ḥattā 'adxula l-balada* as *ich ging zu, bis dass ich in die Stadt kam* 'I went until I entered the city' (see Trumpp, *Einleitung*, 36, last line); this translation, says Fleischer, fits the sentence *sirtu ḥattā daxaltu l-balada*, whereas the translation of the former sentence should reflect the speaker's intention to arrive at the city and not the fact that he has indeed arrived. Therefore, Fleischer translates the former sentence in three ways, which reflect this idea: *ich ging zu, bis dass ich in die Stadt käme / zu dem Ende, in die Stadt zu kommen / in der Absicht, so lange zu gehen, bis ich in die Stadt kommen würde* 'I went until I would enter the city / in order to enter the city / with the intention of going until I would enter the city'. See further Vernier, *Grammaire* II, 496–498, §§1043–1044, where the author expresses Fleischer's opinion and translates all the occurrences of a *manšūb* verb following *ḥattā* using a gerund and not a conjugated verb; Mosel, *Sibawayhi* II, 48, 10 last lines, where the author translates *Sibawayhi*'s example in a similar way to Fleischer's translation: *Ich bin mit dem Ziel, sie zu betreten, gereist* 'I went with the intention to enter it (viz. the city)' and explicitly says that in this sentence it is unknown if this goal (i.e. entering the city) has in fact been achieved or not; Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 73–5–3 and note 8, where the author also translates this sentence without a conjugated verb: 'I travelled [*sic*] up to the point of entry to it (viz. to the city)'; Ibn El Farouk, *Subjonctif*, 127–128. Lane, on the other hand, translates this example in the following words: 'I journeyed until I entered it' (see Lane, II, 509b, 17–18). This translation, which is similar to Trumpp's above-mentioned translation, does not fit the *manšūb* verb following *ḥattā*, as explained above.

in which the action of entering, expressed by the verb *'adxulahā*, is considered the ending point of the domain of the action of walking, expressed by the verb *sirtu*. The sentence *sirtu 'ilā 'an 'adxulahā*²³ has the same meaning.²⁴ Sibawayhi states that there is a similarity between a noun and a verb which follow *ḥattā*: when they indicate the *ḡāya*, the noun takes the *jarr* case and the verb takes the *naṣb* mood.²⁵ He adds that this observation is due to al-Xalīl.²⁶

3.1.1.2. *Ḥattā in the sense of kay* In the second sentence type in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood, *ḥattā* means *kay* 'in order that' and the action of the following verb has not yet occurred. Sibawayhi's example for this sentence type is *kallamtuhu ḥattā ya'mura lī bišay'in* 'I spoke to him in order that he would command [to bring] me something'. Sibawayhi adds that the verb *ya'mura* in this sentence indicates an action which has not yet occurred and that the sentence *kallamtuhu kay ya'mura lī bišay'in* has the same meaning.²⁷ Except for this short explanation Sibawayhi does not elaborate on this sentence type, neither in this chapter (238) nor in the next two chapters devoted to *ḥattā*. Perhaps this is due to the fundamental difference between this and the other three uses of *ḥattā* followed by an imperfect verb: this sentence type is the only case in which the verb following *ḥattā* necessarily indicates an action which has not yet occurred, i.e. in a future time relevant to the time of speech. The *naṣb* mood following *ḥattā* is perhaps easier to grasp in this case, since it is considered to be caused by *'an muḍmara*, which is *'alam al-istiqbāl* 'a sign of the future'.²⁸

²³ On the fact that when preceding a verb *'ilā*, unlike *ḥattā*, should be followed by *'an*, see al-Sirāfi's commentary and Jahn's explanations in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 81, note 2 of chapter 238. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 700, -1-701, 6.

²⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 6-7.

²⁵ In both cases *ḥattā* is considered a *ḥarf jarr*, but only when it appears before a noun does it influence it syntactically and cause it to take the *jarr* case, whereas when it appears before a verb in *naṣb*, Sibawayhi and most grammarians posit an *'an muḍmara* which influences the verb syntactically and causes it to take the *naṣb* mood (see §9).

²⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 7-9.

²⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 9-11. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Ta'liq*a II, 136, 2-6.

²⁸ Regarding this point, see note 25 above and al-Astarābādi's view, presented in §4.3.2 below.

3.1.2. The two sentence types in which the verb following ḥattā takes raf^c

3.1.2.1. *Two consecutive actions in the past* In the first sentence type in which the verb following ḥattā takes the raf^c mood, the action of the verb following ḥattā takes place immediately after the action of the verb that precedes it, and both actions must have taken place in the past. An example of this sentence type is *sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā* 'I walked and indeed I entered it',²⁹ which conveys the fact that there was an action of entering which occurred immediately after the action of walking. In addition, it is understood that these two actions occurred in the past. Sibawayhi then compares the above-quoted example to the sentence *sirtu fa'adxuluhā* 'I walked and entered it', because in both the action of entering, expressed using a verb in the raf^c mood, occurred immediately after the action of walking.³⁰ Finally, he determines that ḥattā here is like 'idā and the other *hurūf al-ibtidā'*,³¹ because in this pattern ḥattā does not have the meaning of 'ilā 'an or kay, and therefore no longer belongs to the category of particles which induce the verb to take the naṣb mood.³²

²⁹ Several explicit remarks by Sibawayhi make it clear that the two actions must have taken place in the past; see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 368, 16–17; 368, 10–13; 370, 10. While some grammarians do understand that this is the correct interpretation of Sibawayhi's position, others erroneously attribute to him the view that in this sentence type the verb following ḥattā denotes an action in the present. For the former see §3.3.2.1-a and for the latter see §3.3.2.1-b.

For modern scholars who correctly understand Sibawayhi's view, see Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 141, –14–4; Mosel, *Sibawayhi* II, 51, §1; Mus'id, *Naḥw*, 99; Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 74, 2–5; 93, appendix B.1. An example of a scholar who misinterprets Sibawayhi's position is Ġazlān. He understands the first sentence type with raf^c discussed here as such where the verb following ḥattā denotes an action in the present and consistently repeats this (see, for example, Ġazlān, *Ḥattā*, 72–73; 75; 77; 79). Since in the second sentence type with raf^c the verb following ḥattā does indeed denote an action in the present (see §3.1.2.2 below), Ġazlān arrives at the incorrect conclusion that according to Sibawayhi the *marfū'* verb following ḥattā always indicates the present.

³⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 11–12. Later in this chapter (see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 368, 13–16), Sibawayhi explains that the comparison made here between ḥattā and fa- is only meant to show that in both cases the two actions occurred consecutively in the past, but it certainly does not mean that the meaning of ḥattā is the same as that of fa-. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 701, 17–702, 2; 707, 3.

³¹ The technical term *hurūf al-ibtidā'* refers to particles which do not affect the 'irāb of the sentences following them, for example, 'innamā; this is followed by the subject of a nominal sentence, which takes the raf^c case due to the influence of the 'amil named *al-ibtidā'* (for this term, see appendix A, note 36). Sibawayhi's intention here is to clarify that in this pattern ḥattā does not function as an 'amil which syntactically affects the following word. It should be noted that Jahn, in his translation of the *Kitāb*, is mistaken in translating the term *hurūf al-ibtidā'* here as 'the particles which appear at the beginning of the sentence'. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 141, –2.

³² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 14–17.

3.1.2.2. *Two non-consecutive actions, the first in the past and the second in the present*

In the second sentence type in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *rafʿ* mood, the action of the verb following *ḥattā* does not occur immediately after the action of the verb preceding it. Also, the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* must have taken place in the past, whereas the action of the verb following *ḥattā* occurs in the present.³³ Often the appropriate translation of *ḥattā* in this case is ‘so ... that’ or ‘such ... that’, as in the following examples given by Sībawayhi:³⁴

- a. *Laqad sirtu ḥattā ’adxuluhā mā ’umna’u* ‘I walked [so much] that I can enter it,³⁵ without anyone preventing me [from doing so]’.
- b. *Laqad ra’ā minnī ’āman ’awwala šay’an ḥattā la’astaṭī’u ’an ’ukallimahu l-’ama bišay’in* ‘he experienced from me last year such a thing,³⁶ that I cannot speak with him this year about anything’.
- c. *Mariḍa ḥattā lā yarjūnahu* ‘he was so sick, that they (i.e. the people) lose hope regarding him’.

Sībawayhi explains that as in the preceding sentence type, the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *rafʿ* mood exactly as the noun takes the *rafʿ* case when it follows *ḥattā*, because in these sentences *ḥattā* is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidā’*.³⁷ Evidence that *ḥattā* in this sentence type is indeed a *ḥarfibtidā’* is provided by the fact that one can add to *ḥattā* an utterance beginning with the particle *’inna*, in the very same manner that such an utterance

³³ There are two differences between the two sentence types in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes *rafʿ* (§§3.1.2.1–3.1.2.2): in the former the two actions are consecutive and must both have taken place in the past, whereas in the latter the two actions are not consecutive and the second takes place in the present. For Sībawayhi’s thorough explanations of these differences, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 368, 5–18.

³⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 17–20; 368, 12–13.

³⁵ Due to the end of this sentence, *mā ’umna’u*, I prefer to translate the verb *’adxuluhā* as ‘I can enter it’ rather than as ‘I enter it’, since it seems to imply that following my walking I now have the opportunity and ability to enter. This is also al-Šantamarī’s view; see al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 701, 11–12.

³⁶ According to Lane I, 998b, *ra’ā minhu šay’an* means ‘he experienced from him such a thing’.

³⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 20–21. For the meaning of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidā’*, see note 31 above.

It is important to distinguish between the *’awāmil* which induce *rafʿ* in these patterns: whereas the noun following *ḥattā* takes the *rafʿ* case under the influence of the *’āmil* named *al-ibtidā’*, the *’āmil* that causes the verb following *ḥattā* to take the *rafʿ* mood is the occurrence of the verb in a position which a noun can occupy (*kaynūnatuhu fī mawḍi’ al-ism*; see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 364, 1 and appendix A, the end of §1 and note 5 there) and not the *’āmil* named *al-ibtidā’*.

can be added to *'idā*, which is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidā'*. In other words, the fact that one can say *ḥattā 'innahu yaf'alu dāka* 'so [much] that he does it', just as one can say *fa'idā 'innahu yaf'alu dāka* 'here he does it', proves that in this case, *ḥattā* is one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidā'*.³⁸

Sibawayhi subsequently provides four additional examples of this sentence type:

- d. *Šaribtu ḥattā yajī'u l-ba'iru yajurru baṭnahu* 'I drank [such a great quantity of water] that the camel would drag its stomach [on the ground, if it drank such a quantity]'.³⁹
- e. *Mariḍa ḥattā yamurru bihi l-ṭā'iru fayarḥamuhu* 'he was so sick that the bird passes by him and feels sorry for him'.⁴⁰
- f. *Sirtu ḥattā ya'lamu llāhu 'annī kāllun* 'I walked [so much] that God knows that I am tired'.⁴⁰
- g. *Laqad ḍuriba 'amsi ḥattā lā yastaṭī'u 'an yataḥarraka l-yawma* 'he was beaten yesterday [so much] that he cannot move today'.⁴¹

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

3.2.1. *The three sentence types in which ḥattā is followed by an imperfect verb*

Unlike Sibawayhi, who attributes the meanings of *'ilā 'an* and *kay* to *ḥattā* followed by *naṣb*, al-Farrā' does not discuss the meanings of *ḥattā* and their possible link to the mood of the following verb. Instead, he presents two principles which should be taken into account when determining the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*: (1) whether or not the verb preceding *ḥattā* denotes a durative action (in al-Farrā's words: *mimmā yataṭāwalu kal-tardādi* 'what lasts'⁴² like a repetition [of a certain action]); (2) the time of the verb following *ḥattā*.

³⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 368, 1–3. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Ta'līqa II*, 138, 2–4, where the author adds that had *ḥattā* here been one of the *ḥurūf al-jarr*, one would have expected *'anna* to follow it rather than *'inna*. To the distinction between *ḥattā 'inna* and *ḥattā 'anna* Sibawayhi devotes chapter 270 (see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 420, 14–421, 7), where he explains that after the *ḥattā* that is a *ḥarf ibtidā'*, *'inna* (and not *'anna*) should be used. The sequence *ḥattā 'anna* is only possible, according to Sibawayhi, when it is *ḥattā l-'āṭifa* (the conjunctive *ḥattā*). Cf. Fleischer, *Schriften I.2*, 406, 6 last lines; Owens, *Grammatical theory*, 38, 1–9.

³⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 367, 23–368, 1.

⁴⁰ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 368, 5.

⁴¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 368, 10–11.

⁴² In reference to al-Farrā's view, Ibn 'Uṣfūr explains that *allaḍī lā yataṭāwalu huwa llaḍī lā yamtaddu* 'what does not last is what does not stretch' and exemplifies such a verb with *qumtu* 'I stood up' (which denotes a momentary rather than a protracted action). See

According to al-Farrā' there are three sentence types in which an imperfect verb follows *ḥattā*. In the first two, which are presented in §§3.2.1.1–3.2.1.2, the time of the action denoted by the verb following *ḥattā* is the past (although it has the form of an imperfect verb), but in the former the preceding verb is non-durative and in the latter durative. The third sentence type, presented in §3.2.1.3, differs from the preceding two because the time of the action denoted by the verb following *ḥattā* is the future.

3.2.1.1. *A perfect non-durative verb preceding ḥattā* When the verb preceding *ḥattā* is in the perfect form *fa'ala* and not durative, the verb following *ḥattā* takes *raf'* and denotes an action in the past, even though it is in the imperfect form. Al-Farrā's example of this sentence type is *jī'tu ḥattā 'akūnu ma'aka qarīban* 'I came and I was close to you'.⁴³

Al-Farrā' states that most grammarians put the verb following *ḥattā* in *naṣb* even if it denotes an action in the past, when its agent differs from that of the preceding verb, as in *sirtu ḥattā yadḫulahā Zaydun* 'I walked until the point of Zayd's entering it'.⁴⁴ He adds that unlike most grammarians, al-Kisā'i reported that he heard examples in which the verb following *ḥattā* took *raf'*, though its agent differed from that of the preceding verb. Here are two of the examples al-Farrā' quotes in the name of al-Kisā'i:⁴⁵ (1) *sirnā ḥattā taṭla'u l-šamsu biZubālata* 'we walked until the sunrise in Zubāla'; (2) *'innā lajulūsun famā naš'uru ḥattā yasquṭu ḥajrun baynanā* 'we sit and do not feel until the fall of a stone amongst us'.

3.2.1.2. *Two durative verbs preceding and following ḥattā which denote actions in the past* When the verbs before and after *ḥattā* are both durative and denote actions in the past, the latter is *manṣūb*. As in the previous sentence type, this verb denotes an action in the past, even

Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 167, 14–15. According to Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 451, 7–9, the meaning of the verb *taṭāwala* as used by al-Farrā' is 'to last, to be durative (an activity; such an activity is similar to a recurring activity); this feature is relevant to the verbal mood after *ḥattā*, and to the occurrence of form II rather than form I'.

⁴³ Since al-Farrā' explicitly states that the verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action in the past, it does not seem appropriate to translate it as 'I came in order that I would be close to you', unless the intention is 'I came in order that I would be close to you and I was indeed close to you'.

⁴⁴ It is noteworthy that Sibawayhi also contends that under these circumstances only *naṣb* is possible, but he gives other arguments (see §6.1).

⁴⁵ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 133, 1–2; 134, 2–8. According to Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1664, 11–13, too, this evidence is due to al-Kisā'i.

though it is in the imperfect form. The verb preceding *ḥattā* can be in the perfect or imperfect form, but in either case it also denotes an action in the past. Al-Farrā'’s example is *ja'ala fulānun yudīmu l-naẓara ḥattā ya'rīfaka* 'so-and-so started and went on looking towards you in order that he might identify you'. Al-Farrā' explains that the *naṣb* mood of *ya'rīfa* is to be explained by the fact that the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* is durative.

According to al-Farrā' the way to determine whether the verb following *ḥattā* indeed denotes an action in the past, even though it is in the imperfect form, is to try to replace it with an equivalent perfect form. If this replacement results in a grammatical utterance, it is obvious that this imperfect form indeed denotes an action in the past. When, however, the verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action in the future, the replacement results in an ungrammatical utterance. An example of the latter is **'adribu Zaydan ḥattā 'aqarra* 'I will hit Zayd until he confessed', because the speaker's intention is the future time, i.e. until this action takes place.⁴⁶

Al-Farrā' subsequently notes that the verb following *ḥattā* in this sentence type takes *naṣb* although it denotes an action in the past, because an imperfect verb here is more appropriate than a perfect one. Here are two examples which al-Farrā' adduces in al-Kisā'ī's name, stating that both indicate the genus⁴⁷ and apply to the past:⁴⁸ (1) *'inna l-ba'ira layahramu ḥattā yaj'ala 'idā šariba l-mā'a majjahu* 'camels became so old that they began ejecting water when they drank it'; (2) *'inna l-rajula layata'aẓẓamu ḥattā yamurra falā* (or: *famā*) *yusallima 'alā l-nāsi* 'men boasted so much that they passed over people without greeting them'.

After he gives these examples, al-Farrā' adds another characteristic to sentences of this type: when the verb following *ḥattā* is negated by *lā* and this negation particle can be replaced by *laysa*, it can take either *naṣb* or *raf'*. If, on the other hand, the replacement of *lā* with *laysa* results in

⁴⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 132, 15–133, 1; 133, 3–11.

⁴⁷ In al-Farrā'’s words: *ṣifātun takūnu fī l-wāḥidi 'alā ma'nā l-jam'i 'a ṣifa* (an expression which elucidates a preceding noun) in the singular with the meaning of the plural'. That is, the sentences contain *lām al-jins* 'the definite article of genus' which is used to indicate any individual belonging to the associated genus. See Wright, *Grammar* I, 269, §345, Rem. a.

⁴⁸ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 134, 9–135, 3.

an ungrammatical utterance, only *naṣb* is possible.⁴⁹ Here are al-Farrā's examples:⁵⁰

- *'Inna l-rajula layuṣādiquka ḥattā lā yaktumaka/yaktumuka sirran* 'the man associates with you so much that he does not hide a secret from you'. In this sentence the verb following *ḥattā* can take either *naṣb* or *raf'* because it is negated by *lā* which can be replaced by *laysa*; this replacement results in the grammatical utterance *'inna l-rajula layu'āxika ḥattā laysa yaktumuka sirran*.⁵¹
- *Lā 'abraḥu ḥattā lā 'aḥkuma 'amraka* 'I will not cease until my decision in your matter'. Here the verb following *ḥattā* must take *naṣb*, because the replacement of *lā* with *laysa* results in the ungrammatical utterance **lā 'abraḥu ḥattā lastu 'aḥkumu 'amraka*.

3.2.1.3. *A verb following ḥattā which denotes an action in the future* When the verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action in the future, it takes *naṣb*, whether the preceding verb is durative or not. Al-Farrā' exemplifies this sentence type with two Qur'ānic verses in which the main verb denotes an action in the future (it is negated by *lan*, a particle which negates an occurrence in the future), and as a result the verb following *ḥattā* also indicates an action in the future. He adds that the Qur'ān contains many similar examples. The two verses are: *falan 'abraḥa l-'arḍa ḥattā ya'dana lī 'abī* 'I will not leave the land until my father gives me leave' (Qur'ān 12:80); *qālū lan nabraḥa 'alayhi 'akifīna ḥattā yarjī'a 'ilaynā Mūsā* 'they said: we will not cease to cleave to it (i.e. the golden calf), until Moses returns to us' (Qur'ān 20:91).⁵²

3.2.2. *Explanations of the different possible moods in the verb following ḥattā in Qur'ān 2:214*

Al-Farrā's commentary on Qur'ān 2:214 contains the main ideas of his theory of the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*, as presented in the sections above. In this verse the verb following *ḥattā* can take either *naṣb*

⁴⁹ It is worth mentioning that al-Farrā' applies this 'replacement test' also to the verb following *'an*. See chapter 1, §3.2-a.

⁵⁰ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 135, 5–136, 9. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1664, 13–15, where the author explains the theory of the replacement of *lā* with *laysa* and attributes it to the Kūfāns in general and not just to al-Farrā'.

⁵¹ The change of the verb *layuṣādiquka* to its synonym *layu'āxika* occurs in al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī*. See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 135, 6–7 and 135, 13, respectively.

⁵² See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 136, 10–13.

or *rafʿ*: *wazulzilū ḥattā yaqūla/yaqūlu l-rasūlu walladīna ʾāmanū maʾahu matā naṣru llāhi* ‘they were so convulsed⁵³ that the messenger and those who believed with him said: when comes God’s help?’. Al-Farrā’ states that readers of the Qurʾān recited the verb following *ḥattā* with *naṣb*, except for Mujāhid and a reader from al-Madīna (i.e. Nāfiʿ) who read it with *rafʿ*.⁵⁴ He subsequently notes that al-Kisāʾī read the verb with *rafʿ* for a while and then returned to read it with *naṣb*. According to al-Farrā’ *rafʿ* is possible because the imperfect verb following *ḥattā* can be replaced with the equivalent perfect verb without rendering the sentence ungrammatical: *wazulzilū ḥattā qāla l-rasūlu*. The reading with *naṣb*, on the other hand, can be explained by the fact that the verb preceding *ḥattā* is durative. ʿAbdallāh’s reading of the verse strengthens this idea: *wazulzilū ṭumma zulzilū wayaqūlu l-rasūlu*.⁵⁵

3.3. Other grammarians

3.3.1. Ḥattā followed by *naṣb*

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that *ḥattā* followed by *naṣb* means *ʾilā ʾan* or *kay*.⁵⁶ Some note that there are instances in which it is

⁵³ According to several Qurʾān commentators and grammarians (al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ* II, 342; al-Zajjāj, *Maʾānī* (1973) I, 277, 5–10; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XI, 308a, 6–9, where Ibn al-Anbārī is quoted), the meaning of the verb *zulzilū* is not ‘they were shaken’ (physically) but rather ‘they were convulsed, terrified’ (mentally and abstractly). They add that the verb *zalzala*, which is derived from the verb *zalla*, implies a meaning of an intensive, durative or recurring action (cf. §3.2.1 and especially §3.2.1.2).

There is a clear link between al-Farrā’'s views on *ḥattā* and al-Ṭabarī's commentary on this verse (see the reference above); both treat the question of whether the verb preceding *ḥattā* is durative. In his article devoted to *ḥattā*, Wild refers only to al-Ṭabarī's commentary and makes no mention of al-Farrā’'s views. He attempts to explain al-Ṭabarī's commentary on the ungrounded assumption that it is related to sentence types in which *ʾinnamā* is used (these are discussed by Sibawayhi; see §7.1). See Wild, *Ḥattā*, 207, –3–208, 3; 219, last paragraph. Talmon also notes Wild's error. See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 84, note 37.

⁵⁴ See al-Farrā’, *Maʾānī* I, 132, 13–14 and note 6, where the editor clarifies that the reader from al-Madīna is Nāfiʿ. Cf. Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 17–18, where the author notes that Mujāhid and the readers of ʾAhl al-Ḥijāz read the associated verb with *rafʿ*.

⁵⁵ See al-Farrā’, *Maʾānī* I, 133, 12–13.

⁵⁶ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 38, 8–9; al-Zajjāj, *Maʾānī* (1973) I, 277, 12–20; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* (1996) II, 151, 7–16; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 79, 9–12; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 201, 2–5; al-Fārisī, *ʾIdāḥ* II, 1082, 15–1083, 3; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣḥābī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 124, 14–19; al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 68, 13–15; al-Rummānī, *Maʾānī*, 119, 8–13; Ibn Jinnī, *Lumaʿ*, 31, 18–32, 1; 32, 13–17; Ibn Fāris, *Ṣāḥibī*, 150, –1–151, 3; al-Harawī, *ʾAzhīya*, 215, 1–13; al-Ḍarīr, *Ṣarḥ*, 102, 4–10; Ibn Burhān al-ʾUkbarī, *Ṣarḥ* I, 183, 6–184, 2; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1083, 4–1084, 9; al-Ṣarīf al-Kūfī, *Ṣarḥ*, 265, 2–4; al-ʾUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 44, 5–9; Ibn al-Ḥabbāz, *Ṣarḥ* I, 167, 2 last lines; Ibn ʾUṣfūr, *Ṣarḥ* II, 164; Ibn ʾUṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 268, 16–17; al-Ṣanʾānī, *Tahḍīb*, 246, 2–3; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Ṣarḥ*, 481, 4–5; al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyāt*, 396a, 13–19.

clear which of the two meanings of *ḥattā* is involved, while in others both are possible.⁵⁷ Some later grammarians contend that the more common meaning of *ḥattā* is of *ʾilā ʾan*, whereas *ḥattā* in the sense of *kay* is not as frequent.⁵⁸

Ibn Mālik contends that *ḥattā* has a third meaning, *ʾillā ʾan* 'unless',⁵⁹ which he exemplifies with the following line of poetry: *laysa l-ʾaṭāʾu mina l-fuḍūli samāḥatan / ḥattā tajūda wamā ladayka qalilu* 'giving of great property is not generosity unless you give abundantly, when what you own is [only] little'.⁶⁰ However, the meaning of *ʾilā ʾan* also fits here, in which case the meaning of the verse is 'giving of great property is not generosity until your giving abundantly . . .'.⁶¹ Later grammarians and lexicographers also mention the meaning of *ʾillā ʾan*, but state that occurrences of *ḥattā* in this sense are rare.⁶²

Al-Astarābādī, in line with Sibawayhi and most grammarians, contends that *ḥattā* followed by *naṣb* means *ʾilā ʾan* or *kay*, but adds that these two meanings characterize not only the *naṣb* but also the *rafʿ* mood.⁶³ This is another instance in which this grammarian attributes to both moods the same meaning; cf. chapter 11, §2.

⁵⁷ Here are three examples adduced by grammarians to show that *ḥattā* can mean either *ʾilā ʾan* or *kay*:

- Šatamtuhu ḥattā yağḍaba* 'I cursed him until his becoming angry/in order that he become angry'. See Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 243, 4–7.
- Sirtu ḥattā ʾadxulahā* 'I walked until the point of entering it/in order to enter it'. See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 59, 26–28; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʾid* III, 116, 9; 116, 14–15.
- Daʾawtu llāha ḥattā yarḥamanī* 'I prayed to God until his having mercy on me/in order that he have mercy on me'. See al-Šanʿānī, *Tahḍīb*, 246, 3–4.

⁵⁸ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 121, 9–12; al-Fākihī, *Šarḥ*, 276, 13–16; Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī* (1910) I, 102, 14.

⁵⁹ See Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, 11; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 24, 6–10 (cf. al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) III, 35a, 22–25, where Ibn Mālik is quoted). Elsewhere in *Šarḥ al-tashīl* (as well as in his *Šarḥ ʾumda*) Ibn Mālik expresses the prevalent opinion among grammarians, that *ḥattā* has only the two meanings of *ʾilā ʾan* and *kay*. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 53, –2; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʾumda*, 336, 8–13.

⁶⁰ A verse in the *kāmil* meter, by al-Muqannaʿ al-Kindī. For an explanation of the verse and the context in which it was said, see al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1904), 128. Cf. Lane, *Lexicon* II, 509b.

⁶¹ This is explicitly said by Ibn ʿAqīl and al-Suyūṭī, who attribute this view to Ibn al-Nāẓim, Ibn Mālik's son. See Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʾid* III, 79, 14–80, 2; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 113, 3–8.

⁶² See Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī* (1910) I, 102, 14–15; al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*, 396b, 12–15; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* I, 340b, 2–4; 340b, 26–32. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1662, 10–1663, 2, where the author rejects the view that *ḥattā* can occur in the sense of *ʾillā ʾan*.

⁶³ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 10–11.

3.3.1.1. *The time of the action denoted by the manšūb verb following ḥattā* According to al-Zajjājī *naṣb* in the verb following *ḥattā* does not necessarily denote an action in a future time relative to the time of speech (absolute future), but may also denote the future with respect to the time of the action of the preceding verb (relative future). He explains that the sentence *sirtu ḥattā 'adxula l-madīnata* is said *'ilā kāna sayruka muttaṣilan 'ilā 'an daxalta* 'when your walking is continuous until you entered [the city]', i.e. when the action of entering already occurred.⁶⁴ Elsewhere he explains the same sentence as meaning *sirtu 'ilā 'an 'adxula*.⁶⁵ Later grammarians explicitly say that *naṣb* in the verb following *ḥattā* is possible when the action denoted by this verb is in an absolute or relative future.⁶⁶

According to al-Astarābādī the *manšūb* verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action which can occur in the past, present or future. He explains that at the time of the action denoted by the preceding verb, the action denoted by the following *manšūb* verb is expected to take place, and with respect to the time of speech it may be in the past, in the present, in the future, or it may not occur at all, because of another occurrence which prevents it.⁶⁷ See §4.3.2 for a discussion of al-Astarābādī's view.

3.3.1.2. *The difference between the two meanings of ḥattā with respect to the time which the following verb conveys* As explained in §3.1.1, Sibawayhi mentions two meanings of *ḥattā* followed by a *manšūb* verb (*'ilā 'an* and *kay*), but with respect to the time of the action denoted by this verb he refers only to the latter meaning and explains that in this sense this action has not yet occurred.

A number of grammarians refer to the time of the verb in the first sentence type, among them al-Zajjāj, who states that when *ḥattā* occurs in the sense of *'ilā 'an*, both verbs preceding and following *ḥattā* denote actions in the past. His example is *sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā* in which, so he says, both actions of walking and entering already occurred in the past.⁶⁸ Al-Jurjānī,

⁶⁴ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 195, 2–3. Cf. *ibid.*, 195, 4–6, where the author explains the possibility of *rafʿ* in *ḥattā yaqūlu* (Qurʾān 2:214; see §3.2.2) as meaning *'ilā 'an qāla*.

⁶⁵ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 201, 2–3.

⁶⁶ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 121, 13; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 234, 3–4; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 54, 4–8; 54, 16–18; Ibn Hišām, *ʿAwḍaḥ* II, 80, 1–2; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qatṛ* (1963), 67, 10–16; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid* III, 116, 9–12.

⁶⁷ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 3–8. Ibn al-Ḥājjib also states that a *manšūb* verb following *ḥattā* reflects the idea that the action denoted by this verb is expected to take place, but its occurrence in reality is not certain and it may or may not take place. See towards the end of §4.3.1 and the reference in note 123.

⁶⁸ See al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1973) I, 277, 12–20 (in line 15 read مضيا instead of نصباً).

in his commentary on al-Fārisī's *ʿĪdāḥ*, also holds this view, but uses a clearer example: *sirtu ʿamsi ḥattā ʿadxulahā waxaraḡtu minhā l-yawma* 'I walked yesterday until the point of entering it and exited it today'.⁶⁹

It should be noted that, contrary to al-Zajjāj's and al-Jurjānī's opinion, there are numerous examples that prove that when *ḥattā* has the meaning of *ʿilā ʿan* the verbs preceding and following this particle do not necessarily both denote actions in the past.⁷⁰ Indeed, several grammarians explicitly say that when *ḥattā* does occur in this sense the following verb may denote an action in the past or in the real future (*mustaqbal ṣarīḥ*), i.e. a time later than the time of speech. They add that in the former case the verb should be treated as denoting an action in the future (*fi ḥukm al-mustaqbal*), because this action is in a future time with respect to that denoted by the preceding verb.⁷¹

3.3.1.3. *The difference between the two meanings of ḥattā with respect to the temporal contiguity of the preceding and following verbs* Al-Ḥarīrī, Ibn Yaʿīš and al-ʿUkbarī state that when *ḥattā* occurs in the sense of *ʿilā ʿan*, the action denoted by the following verb occurs immediately after the action of the preceding verb. On the other hand, when *ḥattā* has the meaning of *kay* the two actions may be separated by an interval of time.⁷² Their observation creates a parallelism to the two sentence types in which the verb following *ḥattā* is in the *rafʿ* mood, one of which is characterized by two consecutive actions and the other by an interval between these actions; see §3.1.2.

3.3.1.4. *Additional examples* Sībawayhi does not adduce many examples of the two sentence types in which *ḥattā* is followed by *naṣb* (see §3.1.1). Subsequent grammarians provide additional examples.

Examples of *ḥattā* in the sense of *ʿilā ʿan*:

- a. *ʿAnā ʿasīru ḥattā taṭlaʿa l-šamsu* 'I am walking/will walk until the sunrise'.⁷³

⁶⁹ See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1083, 4–1084, 9.

⁷⁰ It is interesting to note that in most of the later grammarians' new examples of *naṣb* following *ḥattā* (i.e. examples that are not found in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*), the main verb preceding *ḥattā* does not denote an action in the past; see §3.3.1.4.

⁷¹ See al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 181, 6–8; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 167, –1–168, 6.

⁷² See al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 316, 2–8; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 929, 1–8; 937, 15–21; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 44, 5–11.

⁷³ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 38, 10.

- b. 'Anā 'anāmu ḥattā yusma'a l-'aḍānu 'I am sleeping/will sleep until hearing the call for prayer'.⁷³
- c. 'Anā 'aqifu ḥattā taṭla'a l-šamsu 'I am standing/will stand until the sunrise'.⁷⁴
- d. Idhab ḥattā tukallima Zaydan 'walk until you converse with Zayd!'.⁷⁵
- e. La'antaṣirannahu ḥattā yaqdama 'I will wait for him until his arrival'.⁷⁶
- f. La'antaṣirannahu ḥattā taṭla'a l-šamsu 'I will wait for him until the sunrise'.⁷⁷
- g. Šum ḥattā tağriba l-šamsu 'fast until the sunset!'.⁷⁸
- h. La'amšiyanna ḥattā tağiba l-šamsu 'I will walk until the sunset'.⁷⁹

Examples of ḥattā in the sense of *kay*:

- a. Kallamtuhu ḥattā yu'tīyanī 'I spoke to him in order that he give me [something]'.⁸⁰
- b. Sa'altuhu ḥattā yu'tīyanī 'I asked him in order that he give me [something]'.⁸¹
- c. La'atūbanna ḥattā 'adxula l-jannata 'I will become a believer in order to enter paradise'.⁸¹
- d. Šallaytu ḥattā 'adxula l-jannata 'I prayed in order to enter paradise'.⁸²
- e. Fa'altu l-xayra ḥattā 'aḥūza l-'ajra 'I did well in order to win a wage'.⁸³

3.3.2. Ḥattā followed by raf'

While most grammarians refer to the possibility of raf' following ḥattā and to the differences between putting this verb in raf' and naṣb, a few make no mention at all of the fact that ḥattā can be followed by a marfū' verb. These are Ibn Qutayba, Ibn Jinnī (in his *Luma'*) and al-Harawī.

3.3.2.1. *The time of the action denoted by the marfū' verb following ḥattā* Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi that the marfū' verb following ḥattā denotes an action in the past in the first sentence type and

⁷⁴ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 38, 7–8; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 151, 11–12.

⁷⁵ See al-Zubaydī l-Iṣḥābī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 124, 16.

⁷⁶ See Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 32, 14–15; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 44, 7.

⁷⁷ See al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 102, 9.

⁷⁸ See al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 316, 4.

⁷⁹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 24, 3.

⁸⁰ See al-Zubaydī l-Iṣḥābī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 124, 17.

⁸¹ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 24, 5.

⁸² See al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 68, 14; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 102, 6.

⁸³ See al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 404, 12–13.

an action in the present in the second. Others, notably al-Fārisī, erroneously contend that according to Sībawayhi the *marfūʿ* verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action in the present in both sentence types.

- a. Two grammarians who support Sībawayhi's view are al-Zajjāj and Abū Muḥammad al-Sīrāfi. They explain the two sentence types in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes *rafʿ* exactly like Sībawayhi; cf. §3.1.2.⁸⁴ Abū Muḥammad al-Sīrāfi states that in the first sentence type the action denoted by the imperfect verb following *ḥattā* is in the past, and explains this as due to *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya*.⁸⁵ According to this principle, the meaning of *sirtu ḥattā ʿadxuluhā* is *sirtu ḥattā daxaltuhā*.⁸⁶ Many grammarians explain the *rafʿ* mood following *ḥattā* by using either the complete term *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya* or its abridged version *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl*.⁸⁷
- b. As mentioned above, al-Fārisī in his commentary on Sībawayhi's discussion of the two sentence types in which *ḥattā* is followed by *rafʿ*, erroneously contends that in both of them the *marfūʿ* verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action in the present;⁸⁸ cf. note 29 in §3.1.2.

3.3.2.2. *Additional examples* In addition to Sībawayhi's examples of the two sentence types in which *ḥattā* is followed by *rafʿ* (see §3.1.2), subsequent grammarians provide other examples which are not based on Sībawayhi's basic example *sirtu ḥattā ʿadxuluhā*, among them the following:

⁸⁴ See al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1973) I, 278, 1–10; al-Sīrāfi, *Abyāt* II, 71, 4–7. See also Ibn Burhān al-ʿUkbarī, *Šarḥ* I, 181, 5–182, 5; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 45, 6–10.

⁸⁵ This term is equivalent to the Latin and Greek 'historical imperfect'. This is how Wright translates *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya*. See Wright, *Grammar* II, 30, 15–16 and cf. Dieterici, *Translation*, 307, –6–4. For an extensive explanation of *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya* see Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 341–342; al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Maʿānī* III, 328–330.

⁸⁶ See al-Sīrāfi, *Abyāt* II, 72, 1–4. Cf. Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 246, 7–247, 4.

⁸⁷ See al-Fārisī, *ʿĪdāḥ* II, 1084, 15–1085, 3 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1085, 15–1086, 10; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 103, 11–12; al-Šarīf al-Kūfi, *Šarḥ*, 265, 4–9; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 19–21; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 938, 19–21; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 246, 7–11; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Kāfiya* (1998) IV, 53, 5–6; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 20, 14–21, 3; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 20–21; al-Jāmī, *Šarḥ* II, 245, 1–8; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 54, 16–18; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ*, 295, 14–15.

⁸⁸ See al-Fārisī, *Taʿliq* II, 136, 10; 139, 3. Cf. Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid* III, 117, 11–118, 4 (he is quoted in al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 114, 5–11 without explicitly mentioning his name).

- a. 'Aškala 'alayya kullu šay'in ḥattā 'azunnu 'annī dāhibu l-'aqli 'everything burdened me so much that I think I am becoming crazy'.⁸⁹
- b. Xarajtu ḥattā 'ukallimu Zaydan 'I went out and spoke/am speaking with Zayd'.⁹⁰
- c. Kallamtuhu fī l-'amri ḥattā yumayyilu fīhi 'I spoke with him about the matter [so much] that he has doubts on it'.⁹¹
- d. Ṭalabtu Liqā'aka ḥattā 'uḥaddituka l-'āna 'I asked to meet you and I converse with you now'.⁹²

3.3.3. Criticism of al-Farrā's opinion

Only few grammarians comment on al-Farrā's view on the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*. One of these is Ibn 'Uṣfūr, who quotes al-Farrā's opinion that when the verb preceding *ḥattā* is non-durative, the following verb must take *raf'* (see §3.2.1.1). He exemplifies this principle with the sentence *qumtu ḥattā 'āxuḍu biḥalqihi* 'I stood up and grabbed his throat' and explains that according to al-Farrā the reason for the *raf'* mood in such sentences is that the preceding verb is non-durative and it is impossible to express a *ḡāya* in which it will end. Ibn 'Uṣfūr refutes al-Farrā's view and says that in the above-mentioned sentence *naṣb* is possible if *ḥattā* has the sense of *kay*: *qumtu ḥattā 'āxuḍa biḥalqihi* 'I stood up in order to grab his throat'. He adds that al-Farrā claims to have heard the above-mentioned sentence and similar ones with the associated verb only in *raf'* and not in *naṣb*.⁹³

3.3.4. A possible connection between the occurrence of the action of the verb following *ḥattā* and its mood

Ibn 'Uṣfūr claims that according to the Kūfans, if the action denoted by the verb following *ḥattā* does in fact occur (*ḥādīt*), this verb takes *naṣb*, as in *sirtu ḥattā taṭla'a l-šamsu* 'I walked until the sunrise'; the Kūfans justify *naṣb* in this case by arguing that the sunrise occurs. On the other hand, when the action of the verb following *ḥattā* does not occur (*ḡayr ḥādīt*), this verb takes *raf'*, as in *sirtu ḥattā ya'lamu llāhu 'annī kāllun* (an example already used by Sībawayhi; see §3.1.2.2-f). Ibn 'Uṣfūr disagrees with the Kūfans' explanation that *raf'* in this case is due to the fact that the action

⁸⁹ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 167, 13.

⁹⁰ See al-Zubaydī l-Iṣṣīlī, *Wāḍih*, 124, 10.

⁹¹ See al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 68, 19.

⁹² See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 121, 15.

⁹³ See Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 167, 14–21. For a concise description of this discussion see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1665, 13–17; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 117, 2–4.

of the verb following *ḥattā*, God's knowing, does not occur. He says that this is an obvious mistake because the action of walking, denoted by the preceding verb, leads to the occurrence of the action of God's knowing, denoted by the following verb. According to Ibn 'Uṣfūr the *raf'* mood is due to the fact that the associated verb occurs in the present and that the preceding action leads to its occurrence (for the latter see §6).⁹⁴

3.3.5. *Every marfū' verb following ḥattā can also take naṣb, but not every manṣūb verb following ḥattā can also take raf'*

Although Sibawayhi does not explicitly say so, he clearly thinks that every *marfū'* verb following *ḥattā* can also be put in *naṣb*, but not vice-versa, that is, not every *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* can also be put in *raf'*.⁹⁵ Al-Ḍarīr formulates this idea explicitly.⁹⁶

3.3.6. *Evidence for a dialectal usage in which the verb following ḥattā always takes naṣb*

According to Abū Ḥayyān, al-Jarmī in his book *al-Farx* reports that Yūnus (i.e. Yūnus b. Ḥabīb, one of Sibawayhi's main teachers) claimed that some Bedouins always put the verb following *ḥattā* in *naṣb*. This is subsequently described as *luḡa šādḍa* 'an exceptional dialectal usage', from which no generalizations could be deduced. In Abū Ḥayyān's text it is unclear if this last remark is his or al-Jarmī's,⁹⁷ but according to al-Suyūṭī, who also quotes al-Jarmī's opinion, the remark on this usage as *luḡa šādḍa* is Abū Ḥayyān's.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ See Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 168, 10–22. For a concise description of this discussion see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1665, 2–5. It should be noted that the printed edition of Ibn 'Uṣfūr's *Šarḥ* is defective; wherever the word *ḥādīt* should occur, the orthographically similar *jādīb* is found (حادث vs. جذب). The latter, meaning 'dragging' makes no sense in the discussion. In addition, the former appears in Abū Ḥayyān's *Irtiṣāf* (for the reference see above).

⁹⁵ In chapter 239 of the *Kitāb*, for example, Sibawayhi consistently mentions after almost every example of *ḥattā* followed by *raf'* that when the speaker considers *ḥattā* a preposition which denotes *ḡāya*, the associated verb takes *naṣb*. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 368, 20–21; 368, 21–369, 2; 369, 6–7; 369, 7–9; 369, 13–15.

⁹⁶ See al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 103, 8–10.

⁹⁷ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1663, 15–16.

⁹⁸ See al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 116, 4–5.

3.4. Secondary sources

3.4.1. *The meanings of ḥattā followed by naṣb*

Almost all scholars who treat *ḥattā* mention the two meanings which Sibawayhi attributes to *ḥattā* followed by *naṣb* (‘ilā ’an and kay) and some provide examples.⁹⁹ Some mention the meaning of ‘illā ’an as well (cf. Ibn Mālik’s view in §3.3.1), among them Reckendorf, Brockelmann and Fischer, who contend that this meaning is possible in negative sentences in which *ḥattā* should be understood as *ehe* ‘before’ or *ohne dass* ‘without’.¹⁰⁰

3.4.2. *Other meanings of ḥattā*

3.4.2.1. *The meanings ‘so...that’, ‘such...that’ and ‘even’* Before a verb in *raf’*, *ḥattā* can have the meanings ‘so...that’ and ‘such...that’ (see the examples in §3.1.2). As a conjunction it can mean ‘even’, as in the following line of poetry: *ḥayā ‘ajaban ḥattā Kulaybun tasubbunī / ka’anna ‘abāhā Nahšalun ‘aw Mujāšī’u* ‘what a wonder, even [the people of the tribe of] Kulayb curse me, as if their father were Nahšal or Mujāšī’.¹⁰¹

Brockelmann discusses the three etymologically distinct words for ‘until’ in the Semitic languages, viz. *ḥattā*, *’eska* and *’ad/adi*, which underwent almost the same semantic and syntactic developments. Their basic meaning, ‘until the end point’ of a place, gave rise to the meaning of a limit, or an end point, with respect to time. These words subsequently began denoting the limit to which a certain characteristic rises or an action spreads (‘so...that’). Finally they evolved to mean a limit which was not expected to be attained, and they began denoting ‘even’. In this sense these words do not function as prepositions anymore but

⁹⁹ See, for example, Cheikho-Durand, *Elementa*, 136, 9–10 (part of §113); Erpenius, *Grammar*, 61, 3 last lines; Ewald, *Grammar* II, 116–117; Kosegarten, *Grammatica*, 505–506; Freytag, *Lexicon* I, 340a; de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 479–480 (4th case); II, 24–25 (§55); Trumpp, *Einleitung*, 38, –5––4 and note 3; Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 400–402; Wright, *Grammar* II, 29, §15(c)α; 30, Rem. α; Vernier, *Grammaire* I, 486.

¹⁰⁰ See Vernier, *Grammaire* II, 497, –3–498, 2; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 738, 5–11 (part of §241); Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 540, 16–19 (part of §348.d.α); Gaudefroy-Demombynes-Blachère, *Grammaire*, 442 (end of §438.b); Fischer, *Grammatik*, 198 = Fischer, *Grammatik (translation)*, 224 (§439, note 1). Cf. Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 336–337, where one Ḥadiṭ and several lines of poetry are provided but no references.

¹⁰¹ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by al-Farazdaq. Sibawayhi already quotes this verse to exemplify the sentence type where *ḥattā* has no syntactic effect on what follows it. See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 20–23. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *’Uṣūl* (1996) I, 425, 8–10; al-Fārisī, *Baṣṣariyyāt*, 683, –1–690, 4 (part of *mas’ala* 75).

are rather perceived as in apposition to the preceding noun. Accordingly, Arabic *hattā* in the sense of ‘even’ does not syntactically affect the following noun, as in *jā’a l-qawmu hattā l-mušātu* ‘the people came, even the foot-passengers’.¹⁰²

Lipiński mentions all the meanings which Brockelmann notes, and adds that the use of *hattā* as an adverb in the sense of ‘even’ is reflected in sentences in which the following verb takes *raf’*. He uses one of Sibawayhi’s examples: *marīḍa hattā lā yarjūnahu* (see §3.1.2.2-c) and explains that the verbatim translation of this sentence is ‘he is sick. They do not even have hope regarding him’.¹⁰³ On *hattā* in the sense of ‘even’ see also §12.2.

3.4.2.2. *The meaning ‘finally’* As Fleischer, Reckendorf and Fischer explain, in some contexts *hattā* is best translated as the adverb ‘finally’:

- a. In his discussion of *hattā* followed by imperfect and perfect verbs, Fleischer translates *hattā* in the sentence *ṭumma rtaḥalū wasārū hattā ṭala’ati l-šamsu*, originally adduced by de Sacy,¹⁰⁴ by *endlich* ‘finally’. Fleischer translates the sentence as *dann brachen sie auf und zogen weiter, bis endlich (Folgendes geschah): es ging die Sonne auf* ‘then they went and moved forward, until finally (the next thing happened): the sun rose’. He explains that the end point (in his words: *terminus ad quem*) in place or time, which is linked by *hattā* to the starting point (in his words: *terminus a quo*), is sometimes so far from the latter, that *hattā* can be simply translated by the adverb ‘finally’.¹⁰⁵
- b. Reckendorf criticizes the almost automatic tendency to translate *hattā* as ‘until’. He contends that such a translation may distort the meaning of the whole sentence in certain circumstances. He then provides some sentences in which *hattā* is best translated by the adverb ‘finally’.¹⁰⁶
- c. In reference to the meanings of *hattā* Fischer says that it often leads to an action which immediately follows a preceding one and denotes the end of the latter. In such cases its meaning is ‘until finally, afterwards and finally’.¹⁰⁷

On *hattā* in the sense of ‘finally’ see also §12.2.

¹⁰² See Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 417–419, §258.

¹⁰³ See Lipiński, *Grammar*, 533, §59.2.

¹⁰⁴ See de Sacy, *Grammaire* I, 479, -4.

¹⁰⁵ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 404, -11–3.

¹⁰⁶ See Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 479, §250.c.

¹⁰⁷ See Fischer, *Grammatik*, 198 = Fischer, *Grammatik (translation)*, 224 (end of §439.a).

3.4.3. Ḥattā followed by rafʿ

Not all modern scholars treat the possibility of rafʿ following ḥattā, and their discussions are usually shorter in comparison with those devoted to naṣb following ḥattā. The explanations given to the occurrence of rafʿ after ḥattā are that in such cases the latter denotes time alone and not the speaker's intention,¹⁰⁸ a result ('so that')¹⁰⁹ or a mere fact.¹¹⁰

According to de Sacy if ḥattā does not introduce an action's goal or intention, and thus does not indicate a future idea with respect to what precedes it, it has no syntactic influence on the following verb, because even 'an, under these circumstances, would not have any syntactic influence (cf. chapter 1, §3.1.2.5).¹¹¹

In his *Schriften*, devoted to criticism of de Sacy's *Grammaire*, Fleischer does not comment on the above-mentioned view, but elsewhere in the book he discusses at length the possibility of putting the verb following ḥattā in rafʿ. Fleischer does not refer to the grammarians' statements but rather to relevant examples extracted from various Classical texts. In light of his independent analysis, the parallelism between his explanations and the grammarians' views based on *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya* (see §3.3.2.1-a) is especially salient. Fleischer says that ḥattā followed by rafʿ denotes the end point of a real action that occurred previously. He explains that this end point can be seen as a process which has come to a conclusion, from a backward-looking perspective, but also as something which is occurring, as a historical present, from a forward-looking perspective. In the former a verb in the perfect form is used and in the latter a marfūʿ imperfect occurs as a ḥāl 'circumstantial clause' in the past.¹¹² It is noteworthy that

¹⁰⁸ See Ewald, *Grammar* II, 117, -9--5; Kosegarten, *Grammatica*, 505, §3; Freytag, *Lexicon* I, 340a, §2a); Wright, *Grammar* II, 29, §15(c)β; Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 668, 1-2 (part of §220).

¹⁰⁹ See Trumpp, *Einleitung*, 38, 4 last lines.

¹¹⁰ See Cheikho-Durand, *Elementa*, 136, 20-21 (note b.; part of §113)

¹¹¹ See de Sacy, *Grammaire* II, 24, -1-25, 5. Fischer also contends that when an intention or a possible result are not denoted in the sentence, ḥattā (like 'an) is followed by a perfect or a marfūʿ imperfect verb. He nevertheless adds that in the post-classical language the verb following ḥattā (and 'an) usually takes naṣb whether or not an intention or a possible result are denoted. See Fischer, *Grammatik*, 97 = Fischer, *Grammatik (translation)*, 109 (§196, note 1).

Wild, in the concluding words of his article devoted to ḥattā (Wild, *Ḥattā*, 221, -6--2, §5), rejects the link between an expected or hoped action and the naṣb mood and claims that it cannot be proven according to the grammarians' examples. I disagree and believe that such a link does exist and can be inferred from the grammarians' statements. See §4 and especially §4.3.2. See also §12.1.

¹¹² See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.1, 117, 1-10. Fleischer subsequently exemplifies these two usages.

the grammarians who use the explanation of *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya* also treat the *marfūʿ* verb following *ḥattā* as a form which denotes a *ḥāl* in the past.

Reckendorf and Brockelmann agree with Fleischer. Reckendorf refers to the *marfūʿ* verb following *ḥattā* as denoting a historical present, and explains that for the speaker the action denoted by this verb is at the same level as the action denoted by the preceding verb (which occurred in the past), that is as something seen as finished.¹¹³ Brockelmann briefly notes that in a verbal sentence following *ḥattā* which denotes the limit to which the action spreads ('so... that'; see §3.4.2.1), both a perfect and an imperfect *marfūʿ* verb can appear. He then provides examples of both possibilities.¹¹⁴

4. IS THERE A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING *ḤATTĀ* AND THE TIME IT CONVEYS?

4.1. *Sibawayhi*

With respect to three of the four sentence types in which *ḥattā* is followed by an imperfect verb (see §§3.1.1–3.1.2), *Sibawayhi* mentions the time that the verb following *ḥattā* conveys, whereas in one this issue remains open, namely in the sentence type in which *ḥattā* has the meaning of *'ilā 'an* and is followed by a verb in *naṣb* (see §3.1.1.1).

There are several possible answers to the question of the time that *Sibawayhi* would ascribe to this sentence type:

- a. It is necessarily the future. This possibility seems to me improbable. *Sibawayhi* explicitly says with respect to the second sentence type in which the verb following *ḥattā* is in *naṣb* that the time of this verb is the future, and it is therefore likely that in the first sentence type it is not so, or at least not necessarily so.
- b. It is necessarily the past. This possibility, too, is improbable; had it been so, we would have expected *Sibawayhi* to mention this fact explicitly, just as he does in the first sentence type in which the verb following *ḥattā* is in *rafʿ*. In addition, in the chapter of the *Kitāb* devoted to *fa-* *Sibawayhi* says that the *rafʿ* mood conveys the occurrence of the action of the verb in reality, whereas *naṣb* means that the action did

¹¹³ See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 734, 9–16 (beginning of §241).

¹¹⁴ See Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 540, 7–15 (part of §348.d.α).

not take place.¹¹⁵ This principle seems to be general and not restricted to *fa-*, and if so, this possibility is refuted because an action in the past necessarily occurred.

- c. It is the past, present or future, or none of these, since the action did not, does not or will not occur; by using *naṣb* the speaker merely conveys that the action is expected. This possibility seems to be the most probable. See Ibn al-Ḥājjib's and al-Astarābādī's views in §§4.3.1–4.3.2 and §12.1.

From the above it thus seems that for Sībawayhi the time conveyed by the verb following *ḥattā* is not a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and *rafʿ* moods in a verb following *ḥattā*.

4.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

As explained in §3.2.1 above, al-Farrāʾ posits three sentence types in which an imperfect verb follows *ḥattā*. If this verb denotes an action in the future, it is put in *naṣb*, but if it denotes an action in the past, it takes *naṣb* or *rafʿ* according to whether or not the verb preceding *ḥattā* denotes a durative action. It can be thus inferred that al-Farrāʾ agrees with Sībawayhi that the time conveyed by the verb following *ḥattā* does not necessarily determine its mood. Nevertheless, it is clear that when this verb denotes an action in the future it must take *naṣb*.

4.3. *Other grammarians*

4.3.1. *The verb following ḥattā takes naṣb when it conveys an action in the future and rafʿ when this action occurs in the present*

Al-Jurjānī states that in both sentence types in which the verb following *ḥattā* is *marfūʿ* this verb denotes an action in the present, be it a real present or *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl*. He explains that the fact that the verb denotes an action in the present prevents the *naṣb* mood; *naṣb* is due to *ʾan muḍmara*, which is *ʾalam al-istiqbāl*.¹¹⁶ This is also the view of al-Xwārazmī, who compares the two sentence types with *rafʿ* to the two with *naṣb*: in the former *rafʿ* conveys a real present or a past which should be treated as the present (*fī ḥukm al-ḥāl*), while in the latter *naṣb* conveys a real future or a past which should be treated as the future (*fī ḥukm al-mustaqbal*).¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 376, 7–9. Cf. chapter 6, §3.1.5.3.

¹¹⁶ See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1086, 5–9. Cf. al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 45, 10–12.

¹¹⁷ See al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 181, 4–13. See also Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 481, 7–13.

According to al-Ḍarīr one of the conditions for the occurrence of *rafʿ* after *ḥattā* is that the associated verb convey the present. He adds that a *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* must convey the future.¹¹⁸

Al-Zamaxšarī, too, adheres to the theory that *naṣb* is used when the verb following *ḥattā* indicates a future time, whereas *rafʿ* serves to indicate the present. He says that in either mood the time of the verb following *ḥattā* may be relative or absolute: in the case of *naṣb*, the future time may be relative to the time of the occurrence of the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* (relative future) or to the time of speech (absolute future). Similarly, in the case of *rafʿ*, the present time may be relative to the time of the occurrence of the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* (relative or historical present: *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya*) or to the time of speech (absolute present).¹¹⁹ Ibn Yaʿīš interprets al-Zamaxšarī's position here and explains that the *ʿawāmīl* which induce the imperfect verb to take the *naṣb* cannot influence such a verb when it indicates the present, only when it indicates the future. Therefore, a *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* necessarily means that the time of this verb is future—be it absolute or relative. An example of an absolute future, continues Ibn Yaʿīš, is the sentence *ʿaṭīʾi llāha ḥattā yudxilaka l-jannata* 'obey God so that he will let you into heaven', in which both verbs indicate an action which has not yet occurred, and an example of a relative future is the sentence *sirtu ḥattā ʿadxulahā*, in which both verbs indicate an action which already occurred in the past, but the second is in the future relative to the first.¹²⁰ As for the possibility of a *marfūʿ* verb following *ḥattā*, Ibn Yaʿīš agrees with al-Zamaxšarī that this verb indicates the present, be it relative or absolute.¹²¹

Ibn al-Ḥājjib takes a seemingly similar but actually different position. In line with the above-mentioned grammarians he states that the future characterizes *naṣb* following *ḥattā* and the present characterizes *rafʿ* in the same environment. But unlike them he contends that the future which characterizes *naṣb* following *ḥattā* is only with respect to the occurrence of the first action (relative future), and does not mention the future

¹¹⁸ See al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 102, 17–18; 102, 11.

¹¹⁹ See al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 13–21. Talmon explains al-Zamaxšarī's view and adds that it is difficult to infer it from Sibawayhi's theory of *ḥattā*. See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 94–95, appendix B.3. It should be noted that Talmon does not refer to Ibn al-Ḥājjib's criticism of al-Zamaxšarī's view, which is presented below.

¹²⁰ See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 937, 21–938, 5.

¹²¹ See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 938, 11–23. Al-Zamaxšarī's theory as explained above is accepted by later grammarians such as Ibn Mālik and Ibn ʿAqīl. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 106, 6–9; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ*, 295, 10–12.

with respect to the time of speech (absolute future).¹²² In his commentary on al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal* Ibn al-Ḥāḡib clarifies that *naṣb* following *ḥattā* (be it in the sense of 'ilā 'an or kay) merely conveys the idea that the action denoted by the *manṣūb* verb is expected to occur, but this occurrence is not certain; it may occur in reality but may also not occur at all. Therefore, he says, a sentence such as *kuntu sirtu 'amsi ḥattā 'adxula l-balada* 'I walked yesterday until I came to enter the city' is said both if the action of entering the city occurred or not.¹²³ Ibn al-Ḥāḡib goes on to criticize al-Zamaxšarī's comments on *naṣb* following *ḥattā* from which it is inferred that *naṣb* can reflect the occurrence of the action denoted by the associated verb.¹²⁴ He says that al-Zamaxšarī is mistaken because when the speaker's intention is to convey the idea that this action occurred in reality, this verb takes *raf'*.¹²⁵

4.3.2. Criticism of this position

Al-Astarābādī justifies Ibn al-Ḥāḡib's statements on *naṣb* following *ḥattā* in his *Kāfiya*, and praises him for not mentioning the absolute but only the relative future. According to al-Astarābādī, putting the verb following *ḥattā* in the *naṣb* mood does not necessarily mean that the action which this verb denotes occurs in a future time relative to the time of speech (i.e. the absolute future). *Naṣb* is possible, he states, when this action is in the future relative to the occurrence of the first action, denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā*, because during the occurrence of the first action, the *naṣb* mood of the second verb indicates that the action of this verb is expected to take place, whether, with regard to the time of speech, it has indeed occurred (in the past), is occurring (in the present), will occur after the time of speech (in the future) or will not occur at all due to a certain action which has prevented its occurrence in reality.¹²⁶ Al-Astarābādī goes on to say that the time of the verb following *ḥattā* cannot be the sole definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and *raf'* moods,

¹²² See Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, *Kāfiya* (1998) IV, 53, 3–6.

¹²³ See Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, *Šarḥ* II, 19, –2–20, 12.

¹²⁴ For these comments see al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 15–18.

¹²⁵ See Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, *Šarḥ* II, 21, 1–3.

¹²⁶ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 57, –1–58, 8. Al-Fākihī also states that the *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* may denote an action in the past, present or future, but unlike al-Astarābādī he does not mention the possibility that this action may not occur at all. See al-Fākihī, *Šarḥ*, 276, 8–13.

because in both cases the action of the verb following *hattā* occurs *after* the action of the verb preceding it. Therefore, it is indeed correct to claim that a *maṣṣūb* verb following *hattā* reflects an occurrence in a future time relative to the occurrence of the first action, but this is by no means a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the two moods.¹²⁷ Rather, it should be regarded solely as an answer to the following question: how is it possible that in the sentence *sirtu hattā 'adxulahā*, in which the action of the verb *'adxulahā* can take place in the past, present or future, the verb can take the *naṣb* mood due to the influence of an *'an muḍmara*, which is *'alam al-istiqbāl*? The answer to this question, according to al-Astarābādī, is that the *naṣb* mood of the verb following *hattā*, which is caused by *'an* (i.e. an *'an muḍmara*), is possible since the action of this verb is in a future time relative to the occurrence of the first action, expressed by the verb preceding *hattā*.¹²⁸

After showing that the time of the verb cannot be a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and *raf'* moods, al-Astarābādī arrives at the important question: how can one distinguish between the two moods and decide when to put the verb following *hattā* in *naṣb* and when to put it in *raf'*? His answer to this question is that the distinction between the two moods is strongly connected to the speaker's intention and to the question of what he wishes to express—in al-Astarābādī's words: *dāka 'ilā qaṣd al-mutakallim* 'that (i.e. deciding if the verb takes *naṣb* or *raf'*) depends on the speaker's intention'. Al-Astarābādī explains that the *naṣb* mood can indicate two kinds of actions: (1) one which has not yet occurred (that is, absolute future); (2) one of which the speaker wants to say that it is meant to occur, without implying whether it has indeed occurred or not. This action, elaborates al-Astarābādī, may convey an occurrence in any of the three times (past, present or future), but it can also be that this action does not occur at all, due to another action which has prevented its occurrence in reality. But the *raf'* mood, he explains, indicates that the action has occurred in the past or is occurring in the present and the speaker's intention is to indicate that it has indeed occurred or is currently occurring.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ This conclusion can also be inferred from al-Zajjāj's commentary on Qur'ān 2:214 according to which the different readings of the associated verb with *naṣb* and *raf'* do not represent a difference in the time which it conveys. See al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1973) I, 277, 16–17; 278, 1–4.

¹²⁸ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 9–18.

¹²⁹ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 19–22; 59, 21–25. Other grammarians explicitly say that the verb following *hattā* must be put in *naṣb* when it indicates a future

4.4. Secondary sources

Several modern scholars seem to agree with al-Astarābādī's theory of a strong connection between the speaker's intention and the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*. None of them, however, seems to rely on al-Astarābādī's whole theory as described in §4.3.2 above.¹³⁰ Here is a summary of their expressed views:

- a. Vernier briefly expresses an opinion similar to that of al-Astarābādī.¹³¹
- b. Reckendorf points to the two kinds of actions that, according to al-Astarābādī, the *naṣb* mood can indicate.¹³² He adds that even when the verb following *ḥattā* indicates an action which has occurred in the past, it may be either in *rafʿ*, as an indicator of a 'historical present', or in *naṣb*, as an action about which the speaker wishes to convey that it is expected to occur.¹³³ According to Reckendorf, after a main clause in which the verb indicates the past, the *naṣb* mood may indicate an action which has either already occurred or not, with respect to the time of speech.¹³⁴
- c. Ḥasan also notes the important distinction which al-Astarābādī makes between the two moods. According to Ḥasan *rafʿ* in the verb following *ḥattā* indicates that the action did occur in reality, whereas *naṣb* merely conveys that this action is expected to occur. Ḥasan goes on to say that *rafʿ* indicates that both actions, i.e. of the verbs preceding and

time relative to the time of speech (that is, absolute future), whereas when it indicates a relative future, it can be put in either *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, depending on the speaker's intention. See al-Fākihī, *Šarḥ*, 276, 19–22; Ibn Hišām, *Muǧnī* (1910) I, 104, 7–10; Ibn Hišām, *Jāmiʿ*, 173, 6–7; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 205, 2–10; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 111, 6–7. From what Ibn Mālik and his son say it is also inferred that the speaker's intention is an important factor in the decision as to which mood the verb following *ḥattā* takes. In reference to sentences in which this verb indicates the past, both of them explain that either mood is possible and the decision depends on the speaker's intention. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 121, 17–19; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 481, 16–18.

¹³⁰ One exception is al-Sāmarrāʾī, who does quote al-Astarābādī, but incompletely: he quotes the first part concerning the *naṣb* mood after *ḥattā* (that is, concerning the absolute future), but ignores the second part concerning the speaker's intention to convey that the action is meant to occur, without implying whether it has indeed occurred or not. See al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Maʾānī* III, 376, 1–6. As a result, al-Sāmarrāʾī arrives at the false conclusion that according to al-Astarābādī the occurrence of *naṣb* must mean that the action of the verb will occur in a future time relative to the time of speech. See al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Maʾānī* III, 376, 3 last lines.

¹³¹ See Vernier, *Grammaire* II, 498, §1044.

¹³² See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 735, 3–6 (part of §241); Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 457 (beginning of §226).

¹³³ See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 735, 6–11; 736, 26–29.

¹³⁴ See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 736, 3 last lines.

following *ḥattā*, indeed occurred in reality, whereas *naṣb* indicates that the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* occurred and that the action of the following verb is expected to occur in the future, without the speaker implying whether or not it is about to occur, even if this occurrence is a known fact.¹³⁵

5. THE THEORY THAT IF *QALB* CANNOT BE PERFORMED, THE VERB FOLLOWING *ḤATTĀ* MUST TAKE *NAṢB*

The theory of *qalb* (literally: ‘change, turn upside down’)¹³⁶ first appears in Sibawayhi’s *Kitāb*. From his words and the commentaries of subsequent grammarians it can be inferred that it concerns a change in word order in the sentence. Talmon suggests that it involves changing the imperfect into a perfect verb following *ḥattā*, but this analysis lacks textual evidence.

5.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi treats the concept of *qalb*, which he attributes to unnamed grammarians (*al-naḥwiyyūna*), in chapter 239 of the *Kitāb*.¹³⁷ According to its proponents, *qalb* provides a test which can determine if the verb following *ḥattā* must take *naṣb* or can also take *rafʿ*. Sibawayhi criticizes this idea in strong terms, using five sentences in which the verb following *ḥattā* would be required to take *naṣb* because *qalb* is not possible:

- a. *Kuntu sirtu ḥattā ’adxulahā* ‘I used to walk until the point of entering it’.¹³⁸
- b. *Qad sirtu ḥattā ’adxulahā* ‘I walked until the point of entering it’.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ See Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 344, note 1; 348–349.

¹³⁶ See, for example, Hava, *Dictionary*, 622b, s.v. *qalb*.

¹³⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 2–6; 369, 9–13. For a brief summary of Sibawayhi’s view see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1666, 4–5.

¹³⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 2–3.

¹³⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 5. Talmon translates this example by ‘I have made travels...’. See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 78, 1–3. Of the five example sentences adduced by Sibawayhi, this is the only example on which Sibawayhi does not explicitly say that it denotes the idea that the action occurs several times. From Talmon’s above-mentioned translation it is clear that he considers the action conveyed in this sentence as occurring several times, but I was able to find only a partial and insufficient basis for his view. Talmon’s translation requires that the word *qad* followed by a perfect verb be understood as conveying the meaning of several occurrences; such a meaning of *qad* is only mentioned in conjunction with an imperfect verb, whereas *qad* followed by a perfect verb denotes that something

- c. *Rubbamā sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'I sometimes walked until the point of entering it'.¹⁴⁰
- d. *Ṭāla mā sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'a long time I walked until the point of entering it'.¹⁴⁰
- e. *Kaṭūra mā sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'many times I walked until the point of entering it'.¹⁴¹

On the other hand, says Sībawayhi, in the sentence *sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā* 'I walked and entered it'¹⁴² these grammarians admit *raf'* because *qalb* is possible.

Sībawayhi refutes the theory of *qalb* with the following arguments:

- *Raf'* is possible in sentence a. above since it does not differ from *sirtu marratan fī l-zamāni l-'awwali ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'I walked once in the past and entered it', in which *raf'* is certainly possible.¹⁴³ He thus implies that with respect to the possibility of putting the verb following *ḥattā* in *raf'*, there is no difference whether the main verb denotes an action which occurred several times (*kuntu sirtu*) or one time only (*sirtu marratan fī l-zamāni l-'awwali*).
- It is false that in sentences c–e above only *naṣb* is possible because the action denoted by the main verb occurred several times.¹⁴⁴ As evidence he provides the sentence *sirtu ġayra marratin ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'I walked more than once and entered it', in which *raf'* is possible although the sentence denotes the idea of an action performed more than once. Sībawayhi notes that his Bedouin informants, who speak eloquent Arabic, put the verb following *ḥattā* in *raf'* both in *sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā* as

has really taken place, but not that a certain action occurs several times. See Wright, *Grammar* I, 286, §362(z); II, 3–4, §2; Lane, *Lexicon* VII, 2491a, meaning (4).

¹⁴⁰ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 10.

¹⁴¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 11.

¹⁴² See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 6.

¹⁴³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 3–5.

¹⁴⁴ After Jahn notes that al-Sirāfi does not comment on Sībawayhi's words here, he hypothesizes that the basis of the grammarians' claim is the idea that the action denoted by the verb following *ḥattā* can only result from a single action, that is, only when the verb preceding *ḥattā* denotes a single action can the following verb take *raf'*. Jahn goes on to say that this principle leads the grammarians to claim that if the action occurred several times (as in the examples Sībawayhi provides), it cannot directly lead to the second action and *raf'* is therefore impossible. See Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 82, note 8 of chapter 239. Talmon offers the same explanation, but fails to give credit to Jahn. See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 82, §iii(d). For a different explanation suggested by al-Baṭalyawṣī see §5.3 below.

well as in *rubbamā sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā*, contrary to the grammarians' insistence that *naṣb* is the only possible mood in such sentences.¹⁴⁵

Sibawayhi subsequently provides additional examples of sentences in which *rafʿ* is possible following *ḥattā*, even when the action denoted by the preceding verb occurs several times:

- *Mā 'aḥsana mā sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā* 'how good is my walking, and I entered it'. Sibawayhi explains that in this sentence the verb following *ḥattā* can be *marfūʿ* even though it is unclear how many times the action denoted by the preceding verb occurred.
- *Qalla mā sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā* 'how little did I walk, and I entered it'. Sibawayhi explains that in this sentence the verb following *ḥattā* can take *rafʿ* both when the speaker wishes to convey that there was only one occurrence of walking and when his intention is that there were several occurrences of this action¹⁴⁶ (on the possibility of *naṣb* in this sentence, see §7.1-a).

5.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

I was unable to locate any references to the term *qalb* in al-Farrāʾ's *Maʿānī*. Talmon, however, connects al-Farrāʾ's theory of *ḥattā* (see §3.2) and the theory of *qalb*; see §5.4 below.

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Al-Sirāfi, quoted by Jahn, discusses *qalb* in reference to Sibawayhi's example sentence *kuntu sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā* (see §5.1-a). He argues that the concept involves changing the word order in the sentence, and explains that the grammarians who accept *qalb* do not admit *rafʿ* following *ḥattā* in the above-mentioned sentence because it is ungrammatical to say **sirtu ḥattā 'adxulahā kuntu*. On the other hand, they contend that *rafʿ* following *ḥattā* is possible in *sirtu ḥattā 'adxuluhā* since one can say *ḥattā 'adxuluhā sirtu*.¹⁴⁷ Al-Fārisī, too, contends that *qalb* involves a change

¹⁴⁵ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 9–13. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 706, 8–17.

¹⁴⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 13–17. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 169, –1–170, 2; al-Sirāfi quoted in al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīqā* II, 145–146, note 6; al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīqā* II, 140, 16–141, 1; al-Rummānī, *Šarḥ*, 298, 2 last lines.

¹⁴⁷ See al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 82, note 4 of chapter 239. Talmon provides additional quotations of al-Sirāfi on the theory of *qalb* from the manuscript of

in the word order of the sentence; he rejects the concept, but does not explicitly explain the logic behind it.¹⁴⁸

Al-Baṭalyawsī, in his commentary on al-Zajjājī's *Jumal*, also associates *qalb* with a change in word order, but unlike al-Fārisī he does explain the possible logic behind this theory. According to al-Baṭalyawsī, the grammarians who adopt the idea of *qalb* contend that *rafʿ* following *ḥattā* is possible if putting the verb preceding *ḥattā* (which leads to the occurrence of the action of the following verb)¹⁴⁹ at the end of the sentence results in a grammatical sentence, as in *sirtu ḥattā ʿadxuluhā* (see al-Sirāfi's explanation above). But *rafʿ* after *ḥattā* is not possible, according to these grammarians, in *qad sirtu ḥattā ʿadxuluhā*, since one cannot say **qad ḥattā ʿadxuluhā sirtu*. Al-Baṭalyawsī hypothesizes that proponents of *qalb* compare the main verb, preceding *ḥattā*, with the *ʿawāmil ʾīdan* and *zanantu waʿaxawātuhā* (i.e. *ʿafʿāl al-šakk wal-yaqīn*),¹⁵⁰ which syntactically induce the mood of the following verb and the case of the two direct objects, respectively. Just as the syntactic effect of *ʾīdan* and *zanantu waʿaxawātuhā* is compulsory when they introduce the sentence and optional when they end it,¹⁵¹ so is it in sentences with *ḥattā*, according to these grammarians: when the verb preceding *ḥattā*, which is the reason for the occurrence of the action of the following verb, can end the sentence, its syntactic affect is optional and the verb following *ḥattā* can thus take *rafʿ*.¹⁵² Al-Baṭalyawsī adds that Sībawayhi rightfully rejects this theory, because *ʾīdan* and *zanantu*, which are *ʿawāmil* that affect verbs and nouns, respectively, are quite different from the verb preceding *ḥattā*, which is not an *āmil* at all and does not have a syntactic effect, although it does give the reason for the occurrence of the action denoted by the following verb. It is impossible, concludes al-Baṭalyawsī, to claim that a verb can be an *āmil* with a syntactic effect on another verb, and this is

his *Šarḥ* to Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* and criticizes al-Sirāfi's explanation. See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 79, note 30.

¹⁴⁸ See al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 140, 5–12. Cf. *ibid.* I, 248, 6–249, 8, where al-Fārisī interprets the term *qalb* in the same way. This he does in his commentary on chapter 122 of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, in which this term is used. For the references in the *Kitāb*, see note 159 in the summary below (§5.5).

¹⁴⁹ See §6.

¹⁵⁰ For an explanation of this category of verbs see chapter 4, note 2.

¹⁵¹ Cf. chapter 4, §6.1.2, §6.2.2 and §6.4.2.

¹⁵² See al-Baṭalyawsī, *ʾIṣlāḥ*, 251, 10–252, 2. For a partial summary see Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1666, 16–19.

what these grammarians claim, when they associate the verbs preceding and following *ḥattā*.¹⁵³

Al-Baṭalyawsī also explains the possible logic behind the connection which some grammarians see between the number of occurrences of the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* and the mood of the following verb. According to these grammarians, sentences introduced by *rubbamā*, *ṭāla mā* and *kaṭura mā* (see §5.1-c-e) do not denote a single occurrence of the action but rather an unknown number of occurrences. Since these sentences convey some uncertainty, they are treated on a par with negative and interrogative sentences, in which *naṣb* following *ḥattā* is compulsory (see §7). Al-Baṭalyawsī subsequently explains how Sibawayhi refutes this view with the sentence *sirtu ḡayra marratin ḥattā 'adxulahā* in which *raf'* is possible also according to the grammarians supporting the above-mentioned theory. He adds that Sibawayhi's evidence on *raf'* following *ḥattā* in sentences introduced by *rubbamā*, which implies several occurrences, also refutes this theory.¹⁵⁴

5.4. Secondary sources

Talmon discusses *qalb* at length. In his view it does not denote changing the word order in the sentence. Al-Sirāfi is the only grammarian whom he quotes in favor of this explanation,¹⁵⁵ but as explained in §5.3 this is the prevalent view among grammarians. Talmon argues that what Sibawayhi refutes is the test of replacing the imperfect verb following *ḥattā* with a perfect verb. According to this interpretation, the proponents of *qalb* contend that if such a replacement results in a grammatical sentence, the verb following *ḥattā* in the original sentence can take *raf'*. Such a replacement is possible only when the main verb, preceding *ḥattā*, denotes a single occurrence and not several, because only a single occurrence can lead to a single occurrence of the action denoted by the verb following *ḥattā* (cf. note 144 above). Here are Talmon's main arguments in favor of his view:

- a. Sibawayhi's reference to a link between *qalb* and the number of times the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* occurred: both in his

¹⁵³ See al-Baṭalyawsī, *ʿIṣlāḥ*, 252, 6–11.

¹⁵⁴ See al-Baṭalyawsī, *ʿIṣlāḥ*, 252, 11–22. Cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 115, 15–116, 3, where al-Baṭalyawsī is quoted anonymously. For another possible explanation of the logic behind the idea of *qalb*, see Jahn's view in note 144 above.

¹⁵⁵ See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 79, §d. Cf. note 147 above.

first five examples (§5.1-a–e) and the example introduced by *qalla mā* (the last example in §5.1).¹⁵⁶

- b. The fact that other grammarians adopt the *qalb* replacement test, even if they do not explicitly use this term. Talmon quotes al-Zajjājī who argues that the meaning of *rafʿ* is that the associated verb denotes an action in the past.¹⁵⁷
- c. Al-Farrāʾ's theory of *ḥattā* (see §3.2). As Talmon rightfully states, al-Farrāʾ does not use the term *qalb* and the examples he adduces differ from Sībawayhi's. But one of the main criteria of his theory is whether the verb preceding *ḥattā* is durative, and Talmon links this to the concept of *qalb*. In addition, al-Farrāʾ presents a test which Talmon also links to his interpretation of *qalb*: if a perfect verb can replace an imperfect verb following *ḥattā*, the latter can take *rafʿ* and denote an action in the past (see §3.2.1.2).¹⁵⁸

5.5. Summary

According to grammarians following Sībawayhi, the meaning of *qalb* is a test of changing the word order in the sentence. This explanation corresponds to the regular use of the term by grammarians in general and by Sībawayhi (in various contexts) in particular.¹⁵⁹ According to this explanation, if the main verb, preceding *ḥattā*, can end the sentence, the verb following *ḥattā* in the original sentence can take *rafʿ*.

Contrary to the grammarians' explicit explanations, Talmon argues that *qalb* denotes a test of replacing an imperfect with a perfect verb. His explanation has some plausibility in light of al-Farrāʾ's theory of the number of occurrences of the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* and other grammarians' explanations of *ḥattā yafʿalu* as equivalent to *ḥattā faʿala*. But it is in conflict with the regular use of the term *qalb*, the grammarians' explicit explanations of *qalb* in the context of *ḥattā* and the difficulty raised with respect to *qad sirtu ḥattā ʿadxulahā* (see §5.1-b and note 139). Above all, what refutes Talmon's explanation is the fact that no grammarian explicitly uses *qalb* in the sense of a replacement of an

¹⁵⁶ See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 77–79, §c; 82–84, §IV.

¹⁵⁷ See Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 82, note 34.

¹⁵⁸ For the whole discussion see Talmon, *Ḥattā*, 84–92, §§IV–V.

¹⁵⁹ In chapter 122 of the *Kitāb* (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 206, 5–210, 3) Sībawayhi uses the term *qalb* four times in the sense of 'changing the word order'. See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 206, 17; 207, 8; 207, 10; 207, 14. Cf. note 148 above. A similar use is found in chapter 268 (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 416, 16–417, 1). Other grammarians also use the term *qalb* in the same sense. See, for example, Ibn Fāris, *Ṣāhibī*, 202–203 (*bāb al-qalb*).

imperfect with a perfect verb. In other words, Talmon's view is not supported by any textual evidence.

6. THE VERB FOLLOWING *ḤATTĀ* CAN TAKE *RAF'* ONLY WHEN THE FIRST ACTION LEADS TO THE SECOND

6.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi devotes chapter 240 to this important principle. In chapter 239 there are also some references,¹⁶⁰ but no comprehensive discussion.

In chapter 240 Sibawayhi discusses the principle that only when the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* leads to the action denoted by the following verb, can the latter take *raf'*. Two of his examples are: (1) *sirtu ḥattā yadxuluhā taqālī* 'I walked and then entered my family/belongings'; (2) *sirtu ḥattā yadxuluhā badanī* 'I walked and then entered my body'. In these two examples *raf'* is possible because the first action leads to the second.¹⁶¹

Sibawayhi then gives examples in which *raf'* is not possible because the first action does not lead to the second. In the sentence *sirtu ḥattā yadxulahā Zaydun* 'I walked until the point of Zayd's entering it' *naṣb* is compulsory *'idā kāna duxūlu Zaydin lam yu'addihi sayruka walam yakun sababahu* 'when your walking does not lead to Zayd's entering and is not its reason'. Sibawayhi says that this example is similar to *sirtu ḥattā taṭla'a l-šamsu* 'I walked until the sunrise' in which *naṣb* is also compulsory, because the action of walking does not lead to the sunrise.¹⁶² Later in the chapter he says that *raf'* is possible in the former example if the action of walking leads to Zayd's entering.¹⁶³ Sibawayhi also adds several more complicated sentences, in which two verbs follow *ḥattā*. In these examples, too, the decision of whether or not *raf'* is possible depends on whether the first action leads to the second.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ These occur in a discussion of sentences in which the main sentence does not denote certainty. See the end of §7.1 and the references in note 179.

¹⁶¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 15–17. Al-Sirāfi explains the *raf'* mood in the former example as follows: *duxūluhi bisayrika li'annahu tābi'uka* 'its entrance is due to your walking, because it follows you (or: belongs to you)'. See al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 85, note 1 of chapter 240. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 708, 9–12.

¹⁶² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 13–15.

¹⁶³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 21–22.

¹⁶⁴ For these examples see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 18–372, 9. For some commentaries see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 42, 1–6; al-Sirāfi quoted in al-Fārisī, *Ta'līq* II, 148, note 2; al-Fārisī, *Ta'līq* II, 148, 4–7; 148, –2–149, 3; 149, 9–10; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 708, 13–16.

To conclude the discussion Sībawayhi provides three simple examples which further demonstrate the principle explained above.¹⁶⁵ Here are the first two:

- a. *Sirtu ḥattā 'asma'a l-'aḏāna* 'I walked until hearing the call for prayer'. In this example the verb following *ḥattā* must take *naṣb* because the action of walking does not lead to the action of hearing. Sībawayhi says that it is morning which brings about the hearing of the call for prayer.
- b. *Sirtu ḥattā 'akillu* 'I walked and I became tired'. *Raf'* is possible here because the action of walking leads to getting tired.

6.2. *Al-Farrā'*

As explained in §3.2.1.1, al-Farrā' states that most grammarians put the verb following *ḥattā* in *naṣb* when its agent differs from that of the preceding verb, as in *sirtu ḥattā yadxulahā Zaydun*. But although al-Farrā' agrees with Sībawayhi's opinion discussed above, he does not explain it in the same way. In addition, al-Farrā' quotes some examples on the authority of al-Kisā'i which contradict this principle (see the end of §3.2.1.1).¹⁶⁶

6.3. *Other grammarians*

6.3.1. *Grammarians who support Sībawayhi's view*

Ibn al-Sarrāj, al-Zajjājī and other grammarians agree with Sībawayhi that *raf'* following *ḥattā* (in both sentence types) is possible only when the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* leads to the one denoted by the following verb. They repeat and explain some of Sībawayhi's sentences,¹⁶⁷ and some provide additional examples as well.¹⁶⁸

Several grammarians explain why putting the verb following *ḥattā* in *raf'* requires that the first action lead to the second. Ibn al-Ḥājjib criticizes al-Zamaxšārī for not mentioning this principle in his *Mufaṣṣal*. He says that in both sentence types with the verb after *ḥattā* in *raf'* this

¹⁶⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 12–14.

¹⁶⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 134, 3–8.

¹⁶⁷ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 151, 19–20; 152, 2–9; 153, 1–3; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 202, 4–8; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 701, 7–10; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 938, 11–13; 938, 21–23; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 102, 18–103, 2; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 27–30; Ibn Hišām, *Awḍaḥ* II, 80, 6–81, 2; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 104, 14–17. Cf. Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 734, 19–32.

¹⁶⁸ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 202, 7; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 59, 18–19.

connection between the two verbs is necessary, whereas in the case of *naṣb* it is not. In his view, when a *marfūʿ* verb follows *ḥattā*, the two sentences, before and after *ḥattā*, are syntactically independent (*ḥattā* is not an *ʿamil* there), and for a connection to be established between them a causal link (*sababiyya*) is needed, i.e. the fact that the first action leads to the second (for this term see appendix A, §12). When a *manṣūb* verb follows *ḥattā*, on the other hand, there is only a single sentence in which *ḥattā* occurs as a *ḥarfjarr* and the verb after *ḥattā*, together with a preceding *ʿan muḍmara*, occupies the position of a *majrūr* noun (see §9). In other words, in instances of *naṣb* there is a strong syntactic link between what precedes and follows *ḥattā*, so that the link of *sababiyya* is not necessary.¹⁶⁹

As for sentences in which the agent of the verb following *ḥattā* differs from that of the preceding verb, some grammarians explain, in line with Sībawayhi, that the usual structure of *rafʿ* following *ḥattā*, in which the first action leads to the second, is when these two are carried out by the same agent. When there are two different agents, on the other hand, the first action does not usually lead to the second, as in *sirtu ḥattā taṭlaʿa l-šamsu* in which only *naṣb* is possible. However, like Sībawayhi, they note that sometimes it is clear from the context of such sentences that the first action leads to the second, and then *rafʿ* is possible.¹⁷⁰

7. WHEN THE MAIN VERB IS NEGATED OR THE OCCURRENCE IS QUESTIONED, THE VERB FOLLOWING ḤATTĀ MUST TAKE NAṢB

7.1. Sībawayhi

Sībawayhi explicitly formulates the principle discussed below, which can be inferred from that of the preceding section, only towards the end of his discussion.¹⁷¹ Here are some examples he provides to show that the verb following *ḥattā* must take *naṣb* when it is preceded by a verb which is negated or denotes an action whose occurrence is questioned:

- a. *Qallaʾ/aqalla mā sirtu ḥattā ʾadxulahā* ‘I did not walk until the point of entering it’. Sībawayhi explains that in this sentence the verb following *ḥattā* must take *naṣb* when the speaker’s intention is that the action of

¹⁶⁹ See Ibn al-Hājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 21, 3–11. Cf. al-Fākihī, *Šarḥ*, 276, –2–277, 1.

¹⁷⁰ See Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 165, 20–166, 5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣhīl* II.2, 55, 3–7; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʾid* III, 117, 5–8.

¹⁷¹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 1–2.

walking did not occur¹⁷² (on the possibility of *rafʿ* in this sentence, see the last example in §5.1).

- b. *ʿInnamā sirtu ḥattā ʿadxulahā* ‘hardly did I walk until the point of entering it’. According to Sibawayhi *naṣb* is compulsory when the action of walking, which leads to the action of entering, is insignificant. In other words, when one conceives of *ʿinnamā* as what later became known as a *ḥarf iḥtiqār* meaning ‘hardly, barely’, the intention is to negate the first action, and *naṣb* is thus compulsory. Sibawayhi notes that this view is due to al-Xalil.¹⁷³ However, as in the preceding example, here, too, *rafʿ* is possible. Although Sibawayhi does no more than note the possibility of *rafʿ* without any explanation,¹⁷⁴ it is clear that here, as in the previous example, the explanation lies in the way the word introducing the sentence, viz. *ʿinnamā*, is understood.¹⁷⁵
- c. *ʿAyyuhum sāra ḥattā yadxuluhā* ‘which of them walked and entered it?’. Sibawayhi explains that *rafʿ* here is possible because what is questioned is not the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* but rather its agent. In other words, although we formally have a question and not an indicative sentence denoting certainty, the verb following *ḥattā* can take *rafʿ* because it is clear that the actions denoted by the verbs preceding and following *ḥattā* did indeed both take place.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷² See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 17–18. Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 169, 12–17; al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 141, 2–8; al-Fārisī, *Baḡdādīyyāt*, 300, 5 last lines; al-Rummānī, *Šarḥ*, 298, 14–17; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 705, 15–18.

¹⁷³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 21–370, 3. Al-Fārisī explains that *laysa šayʿun ʿaqraba ʿilā l-naḫfi minā l-qillati* ‘nothing is closer to [absolute] negation than paucity’; *ʿinnamā* which functions as a *ḥarf iḥtiqār* is accordingly treated in the same way as a negation word and the verb following *ḥattā* must thus take *naṣb*. See al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 142, 7–10.

¹⁷⁴ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 6–7.

¹⁷⁵ Al-Sirāfi explains that *rafʿ* is possible when the speaker’s intention is not to negate the first action and to state that the action of walking did not take place, but rather that only this action occurred. In this case *ʿinnamā* is perceived as a *ḥarf iḥtiqār* in the sense of ‘only’ and not as a *ḥarf iḥtiqār* in the sense of ‘hardly, barely’. See al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 83, note 16 of chapter 239. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 705, 5–14.

In this context one can note Wild’s misunderstanding of Sibawayhi’s words on sentences introduced by *ʿinnamā*. According to Wild, *Ḥattā*, 207, –7–3, Sibawayhi’s discussion of *ʿinnamā* as a *ḥarf iḥtiqār* is merely an addition of a rule which clearly shows that the subject of *ḥattā* was unclear to the grammarians themselves. Wild contends that this is yet another complication of the already complicated rules of *ḥattā*, and he fails to see the clear link between *ʿinnamā* as a *ḥarf iḥtiqār* and sentences in which the verb preceding *ḥattā* is negated and the following verb must thus take *naṣb*.

¹⁷⁶ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 4–5. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 144, 8–145, 4; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 59, 6–7. See also al-Fārisī, *ʿIḡfāl* II, 130–132 (*masʿala* 42).

- d. 'Ayna llaḍī sāra ḥattā yadxuluhā waqad daxalahā 'where is the one who walked and entered it?'. In this example, exactly as in the preceding one, *raf'* is possible due to the same reasoning.¹⁷⁷
- e. 'Asirta ḥattā tadxulahā 'did you walk until the point of entering it?'. This example differs from the preceding two because *naṣb* here is compulsory; the sentence contains no confirmation that the first action occurred and thus led to the second.¹⁷⁸

The idea behind the principle exemplified in the above-mentioned examples is that *ḥattā* followed by *raf'* requires that the second action be caused by and immediately follow the first. Therefore, if the first action is negated the second cannot occur; only the occurrence of the first can lead to that of the second. If the first action does not occur, it is clear that it cannot lead to the second, and therefore *raf'* is not possible.¹⁷⁹

7.2. Al-Farrā'

Al-Farrā' does not explicitly refer to this issue.

7.3. Other grammarians

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi's view discussed above. Al-Zajjājī, for example, formulates and explains the general principle like Sibawayhi, and gives additional examples of negative sentences in which only *naṣb* can follow *ḥattā*.¹⁸⁰ Al-Xwārazmī briefly says that whenever the utterance preceding *ḥattā* does not denote an action whose occurrence is certain, the following verb must be *manṣūb*. Except for the negative and interrogative utterances, which most grammarians mention in this context, he also conceives of the imperative as a similar case following which *ḥattā* must be followed by *naṣb*, because it, too, does not denote an action whose occurrence is certain.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁷ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 5–7.

¹⁷⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 371, 11–12. Cf. al-Fārisī, *ʿIdāh* II, 1087, 3–7 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1087, 8–1088, 5; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 939, 17–24; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 23, 1–9. See also Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 736, 3–14 (part of §241); Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 350.

¹⁷⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 369, 18–21; 370, 1–3; 371, 11–12. Cf. al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 141, 8–16 (in line 10 read *بقي* instead of *نفي*).

¹⁸⁰ See al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 201, –1–202, 3. Cf. his commentators al-Baṭalyawsī and Ibn ʿUṣfūr in al-Baṭalyawsī, *ʾIṣlāḥ*, 249, –3–250, 4; Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 164, –1–165, 5. See also al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 58, 27–59, 4; 61, 7–8.

¹⁸¹ See al-Xwārazmī, *Mafātīḥ*, 63, 3–4. For examples in which *ḥattā* is followed by *naṣb* when the preceding utterance is introduced by a verb in the imperative, see §3.3.1.4.

8. WHEN ḤATTĀ AND THE FOLLOWING VERB ARE AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE SENTENCE, THE VERB MUST TAKE NAṢB

8.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi adduces several examples of this principle:

- a. *Kāna sayrī 'amsi ḥattā 'adxulahā* 'my walking yesterday was until the point of entering it'. In this sentence the verb following *ḥattā* must take *naṣb* if the compound *ḥattā 'adxulahā* functions as *xabar kāna*,¹⁸² which is an essential element in the sentence. Putting the verb in *rafʿ*, *Sibawayhi* adds, would cause the sentence to lack a *xabar*, an essential element, and is thus impossible.¹⁸³ However, there are two possibilities of putting the associated verb following *ḥattā* in *rafʿ*: (1) if the word *'amsi* is taken as *xabar kāna*; (2) if *kāna* itself is not conceived as *kāna l-nāqiṣa* but as *kāna l-tāmma* in the sense of *waqa'a* 'to occur'.¹⁸⁴ If either of these two conditions is realized the utterance *kāna sayrī 'amsi* is complete and so the verb following *ḥattā* may be *marfūʿ*.¹⁸⁵
- b. *Kāna sayrī 'amsi sayran mut'iban ḥattā 'adxuluhā* 'my walking yesterday was tiring and I entered it'. In this sentence the compound *sayran mut'iban* functions as *xabar kāna*, and therefore the utterance *ḥattā 'adxuluhā* is not an essential element in the sentence. The verb following *ḥattā* here can thus take *rafʿ*.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸² *Xabar kāna* is 'the *xabar* which occurs in a sentence beginning with *kāna* [...] the *xabar* of *ism kāna*'. This explanation is taken from Levin, *Kāna*, 205, 23. See further *ibid.*, 203–205, §2.6.

¹⁸³ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 370, 3–4.

¹⁸⁴ *Kāna l-nāqiṣa* denotes only time (*zamān*) and not existence (*ḥadaṭ*), whereas *kāna l-tāmma* indicates both. For *kāna l-nāqiṣa* and *kāna l-tāmma* see Wright, *Grammar* II, 99, 5–100, 6 (§41). On the verb's denoting *zamān* and *ḥadaṭ* see Levin, *ʿAmal*, 226, note 77.

¹⁸⁵ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 370, 13–15, where the author mentions only the former possibility.

For grammarians who explain both possibilities see al-Fārisī, *Ta'liq* II, 142, 11–143, 3; 143, 1–144, 3; al-Fārisī, *ʿIdāḥ* II, 1088, 6–13 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1088, 14–1089, 17; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 103, 12–17; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 1–3; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* II, 939, 8–17; Ibn al-Ḥāḍib, *Šarḥ* II, 22, 9–21.

For grammarians who explain only the latter possibility see al-Baṭalyawṣī, *ʾIṣlāḥ*, 250, 14–15; al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 404, 8–10; Ibn al-Ḥāḍib, *Kāfiya* (1998) IV, 53, 6–8; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 61, 5–7.

¹⁸⁶ See *Sibawayhi*, *Kitāb* I, 370, 4–6.

It is noteworthy that Sibawayhi does no more than note this principle without explaining the logic behind it. Al-Fārisī gives the explanation (see §8.3).

8.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not mention this issue.

8.3. *Other grammarians*

Al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj provide similar examples to Sibawayhi's and explain them like him.¹⁸⁷ Al-Fārisī explains Sibawayhi's intention in this context: when the verb following *hattā* takes *raf'*, the utterances preceding and following *hattā* are two separate sentences, whereas an utterance in which a *manšūb* verb follows *hattā* forms one sentence only, together with the preceding utterance.¹⁸⁸ The verb following *hattā* must therefore take *našb* if the preceding utterance is not a complete sentence; putting the verb in *raf'* requires two separate and independent sentences.¹⁸⁹

9. IS THERE AN 'AN MUḌMARA AFTER ḤATTĀ?

9.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi argues that the verb following *hattā* is *manšūb* not due to its direct effect but to an 'an muḍmara. This he does in chapter 234 of the *Kitāb*, where he discusses the particles following which 'an muḍmara is posited and characterizes *li-* and *hattā* as such.¹⁹⁰

As for the question of whether 'an can follow *hattā* in the literal utterance, Sibawayhi refers to both *hattā* and *kay* and argues that an overt 'an must not follow them. For details on this issue, which became a dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans, see §9.3.3.3.

¹⁸⁷ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 43, 6–11; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 153, 4–9.

¹⁸⁸ See al-Fārisī, *Ta'liq* II, 136, 12–13. Cf. Ibn al-Ḥājjib's similar view in §6.3 (see the reference in note 169) and al-Fārisī's similar explanation with respect to *fa-* in chapter 6, note 17.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 735, 11–23 (part of §241).

¹⁹⁰ Cf. chapter 9, §8.1. See further Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 344, 8–11, where the author refers to *hattā* as one of the *hurūf al-jarr*. This was already mentioned in Levin, *Prepositions*, 344, note 25.

9.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not discuss this question in his *Ma'ānī*, but some grammarians attribute to the Kūfan school in general and to him in particular the opinion that *ḥattā* itself induces the following verb to take *naṣb* (see §9.3.2 below).

9.3. *Other grammarians*

Başrans and Kūfans disagree on which *'āmil* induces *naṣb* in the verb after *ḥattā*. The prevalent view is that of the Başrans, according to which the verb following *ḥattā* is *manṣūb* due to an *'an muḍmara*. The Kūfans, on the other hand, contend that *ḥattā* itself syntactically induces the following verb to take *naṣb*. Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a chapter in his *'Inṣāf* to this issue, whose concise description is presented in §9.3.3.1 below.

9.3.1. *The verb following ḥattā takes naṣb due to 'an muḍmara*

Most grammarians hold this opinion, which corresponds to Sibawayhi's and is attributed to the Başrans in general.¹⁹¹ Some use the principle of *al-'āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ* in their explanations.¹⁹² Al-Fārisī explains that the mood of the *manṣūb* verb following *ḥattā* is due to an *'an muḍmara*, and adds that this *'an* and the *manṣūb* verb occupy the position of a *majrūr* noun (due to the effect of *ḥattā*, a preposition which syntactically influences nouns).¹⁹³

9.3.2. *Ḥattā directly induces the following verb to take naṣb*

Some grammarians attribute this opinion to al-Kisā'ī,¹⁹⁴ and others to al-Farrā' as well.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 300, 12–301, 1; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 6, 2–7, 1; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 77, 6; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 31, 18–32, 1; 32, 13–17; al-Baṭalyawṣī, *'Iṣlāḥ*, 49, 4–5; 50, 4–6.

¹⁹² See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 38, 1–7; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) I, 426, 5–9; II, 151, 6–7; al-Zajjājī, *Ma'ānī* (1973) I, 180, 10–15; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 119, 8–11.

¹⁹³ See al-Fārisī, *Ta'liq* II, 135, 11–136, 1; al-Fārisī, *'Iḍāḥ* II, 1079, 5–12 and his commentator al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1079, 13–1080, 10. See also al-Warrāq, *'Ilal*, 74, 14–20.

¹⁹⁴ See al-Baṭalyawṣī, *'Iṣlāḥ*, 49, 4–5; 50, 4–6; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 79, 5–8. See also Hegazi, *al-Sirāfi*, 66, where this opinion is attributed to al-Kisā'ī as opposed to Sibawayhi and al-Sirāfi.

¹⁹⁵ See, for example, al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 111, 2–3; 112, 3–5.

9.3.3. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans on the ‘āmil which induces the verb following ḥattā to take naṣb*

9.3.3.1. *The dispute as presented in Ibn al-Anbārī's ‘Inṣāf* Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a chapter in his *‘Inṣāf* to this dispute;¹⁹⁶ here is a summary of the discussion.

According to the Kūfans the verb following *ḥattā* is *manṣūb* due to its direct effect, whereas the Baṣrans claim that an *‘an muḍmara* is the *‘āmil* which induces *naṣb*. The Kūfans argue that *ḥattā* followed by *naṣb* has the sense of *kay* or *‘ilā ‘an*, both of which directly induce the verb to take *naṣb*, and that the verb following *ḥattā* takes *naṣb* in the same manner. The Baṣrans reject the Kūfans' view and follow the principle of *al-‘āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ*: since *ḥattā* is a *ḥarf jarr*, i.e. an *‘āmil* which syntactically affects nouns, it cannot simultaneously function as an *‘āmil* of verbs which induces the *naṣb* mood. This mood is thus due to the effect of an *‘an muḍmara*. To prove their view the Baṣrans quote a line of poetry where *ḥattā* is followed by a noun in *jarr* which is connected by the conjunction *wa-* to a *manṣūb* verb: *dāwaytu ḡabna ‘Abī l-Dahīqa bimaṭlihi / ḥattā l-maṣīfi wataḡluwa l-qī’dānu* ‘I dealt with Abū l-Dahīq’s fraud by putting off his promise¹⁹⁷ until the time of summer and the growth of the young camels’.¹⁹⁸ Since *ḥattā* is followed by a *majrūr* noun it is clear that it is a *ḥarf jarr* which syntactically influences nouns. The *manṣūb* verb connected to this noun must therefore take *naṣb* due to an *‘an muḍmara*, and the combination of this *‘an* and the *manṣūb* verb is equivalent to a *majrūr* noun (cf. the end of §9.3.1 above).

9.3.3.2. *Additional arguments in favor of the Baṣrans’ view in al-Suyūṭī’s ‘Aṣbāh and Ham’* Al-Suyūṭī supports the Baṣrans’ view and raises additional arguments in its favor:

- a. *Al-‘Idmāru ‘aḥsanu minā l-‘iṣrāki* ‘concealing is better than partnership’. Al-Suyūṭī states that concealing an element in the speaker’s mind (here: an *‘an muḍmara*) is better than partnership in the grammatical

¹⁹⁶ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *‘Inṣāf*, 247–250 (*mas’ala* 83). For a concise description of the discussion and the arguments presented by the two sides, see al-‘Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 44, 12–45, 2; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 249, 12–250, 4; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Ṣarḥ* I, 168, 7–10.

¹⁹⁷ For this meaning of *maṭl* see Hava, *Dictionary*, 725b.

¹⁹⁸ The author of this verse, in the *kāmil* meter, is unknown. In addition to Ibn al-Anbārī other grammarians also quote this verse to prove that *naṣb* following *ḥattā* is due to an *‘an muḍmara*. See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1080, 11–1081, 8; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 249, 16–250, 4.

effect (i.e. having an 'āmīl influence both nouns and verbs; the contrary of *al-ʿāmīl lahu xtiṣāṣ*).¹⁹⁹

- b. According to the Baṣrans *ḥattā* is an 'āmīl which influences nouns, whereas the Kūfāns claim that it influences verbs. Al-Suyūṭī states that when there is doubt about whether a certain word is an 'āmīl of nouns or verbs, the former is preferable; the 'awāmīl which induce the cases of nouns are the basis, and those which influence the moods of verbs are derived from them. In addition, the former type is much more frequent than the latter.²⁰⁰
- c. Al-Suyūṭī compares the *naṣb* mood after *ḥattā* and after *kay*. He supports Sibawayhi's view that *ḥattā* is a *ḥarf jarr*, unlike *kay* which can be conceived as either a *ḥarf jarr* or a *ḥarf naṣb* (see §9.1 above and chapter 3, §6.1, respectively). He subsequently quotes part of Abū Ḥayyān's discussion in his *Šarḥ kitāb al-tashīl* on the reasons for this difference between *ḥattā* and *kay*:²⁰¹ (1) the *naṣb* mood following *kay* is much more frequent than the *jarr* case and the latter cannot be explained as an instance of the former, since *kay* which induces the *jarr* case always occurs in the literal utterance and is never concealed in the speaker's mind. *Kay* must therefore be considered a *ḥarf jarr*, too, in addition to its function as a *ḥarf naṣb*. On the other hand, the instances of the *jarr* case following *ḥattā* are very frequent and those of the *naṣb* mood can also be interpreted as instances of the *jarr* case, since what induces *naṣb* (viz. an 'an *muḍmara*) is concealed in the speaker's mind and does not appear in the literal utterance; (2) were *ḥattā* to directly induce the following verb to take *naṣb*, it would have to denote an action in the future, like 'an and *lan*, but this is not so; (3) *ḥattā* is sometimes followed by a *manṣūb* verb connected to a *majrūr* noun, as in *maṣaytu ṣadra l-nahāri ḥattā l-zawāli wataštadda l-hājiratu* 'I walked during the beginning of the day until the sun rising high and the vehement midday heat becoming strong'.²⁰² This sentence is grammatical; a conjunction cannot connect two different entities unless one can be

¹⁹⁹ See al-Suyūṭī, *ʿAšbāḥ* (1998) I, 156.

²⁰⁰ See al-Suyūṭī, *ʿAšbāḥ* (1998) I, 403, 1–7.

²⁰¹ For the whole discussion see al-Suyūṭī, *ʿAšbāḥ* (1998) II, 571, 5–572, 8. It should be noted that al-Suyūṭī only quotes the first of the following three reasons from Abū Ḥayyān's *Šarḥ kitāb al-tashīl*; the other two are provided by the editor of al-Suyūṭī's *ʿAšbāḥ* from a manuscript of *Šarḥ kitāb al-tashīl*. See *ibid.*, 572, note 5.

²⁰² For these meanings of *zawāl* and *hājira* see Lane, *Lexicon* III, 1271a and VIII, 2881b–c, respectively.

interpreted by the other. Cf. the line of poetry quoted and discussed towards the end of §9.3.3.1 above.

- d. When the interrogative particle *mā* is joined to *ḥattā*, its long final vowel *ā* is shortened to *a*, thus creating the word *ḥattāma* ‘until what?’. This is further evidence for *ḥattā* being a *ḥarfjarr*, since the same also happens with other prepositions to which *mā* is joined, as in *lima* ‘for what?’. Al-Suyūṭī subsequently quotes a line of poetry in which *ḥattāma* occurs.²⁰³

9.3.3.3. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans on whether ‘an can follow ḥattā* The prevalent view among grammarians is that ‘an cannot follow *ḥattā*.²⁰⁴ Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a chapter in his *‘Inṣāf* to this question, in which he jointly discusses *kay* and *ḥattā* and presents this issue as a dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans. For details see chapter 3, §6.3.3.

10. THE SEPARATION BETWEEN ḤATTĀ AND THE FOLLOWING VERB

10.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi does not explicitly refer to this issue.

10.2. *Al-Farrā’*

Al-Farrā’, too, does not comment on this question.

10.3. *Other grammarians*

Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses this question at length. He attributes to al-Axfaš the view that a protasis can separate *ḥattā* from the following verb, in which case the latter takes *naṣb* or *jazm*, as in *intaẓir ḥattā ‘in yuqsam šay’un ta’xuḍa/ta’xuḍ* ‘wait until, if something is divided, you take [some]’. The *naṣb* mood is explained as due to *ḥattā*, as if the sentence were *intaẓir ḥattā ta’xuḍa ‘in yuqsam šay’un*, and *jazm* is explained as due to the associated verb being taken as introducing the apodosis of the protasis ‘in *yuqsam*. Ibn al-Sarrāj criticizes this view and argues that *ḥattā* should not be separated from the following verb. In his opinion the verb in the

²⁰³ See al-Suyūṭī, *Ham’* IV, 111, 13–16. Cf. al-Jawharī, *Tāj* I, 115, 23–25 (and al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994) III, 36b, 14–18, where al-Jawharī is quoted).

²⁰⁴ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Ma’ānī* (1985) I, 301, 3–6; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma’*, 31, 18–32, 1; 32, 13–17; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 205, 17–21; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 264, 11–265, 1.

above-mentioned example should be *majzūm* because it introduces the apodosis.²⁰⁵ He further states that although nothing should separate *ḥattā* from the following verb, a separation by a *ẓarf* is better than by a protasis (as in the example above). His example is *lā wallāhi ḥattā 'idā 'amartuka bi'amrin tuṭī'unī/tuṭī'anī* 'no, by God, until when I command you to do something, you obey me'. Here the *raf'* mood is due to the verb *tuṭī'unī* being conceived as the *jawāb* of *'idā*, whereas the *naṣb* mood of the verb is explained as due to *ḥattā* despite the separation between them.²⁰⁶

Abū Ḥayyān and Ibn 'Aqīl say that according to Hišām (probably Hišām b. Mu'āwiya, one of al-Kisā'ī's disciples) *ḥattā* can be separated from the following verb by: (1) an oath, as in *ḥattā wallāhi 'ātiyaka* 'until, by God, my coming to you'; (2) a direct object, as in *ḥattā Zaydan 'aḍriba* 'until my hitting Zayd'; (3) a prepositional phrase, as in *'aṣbiru ḥattā 'ilayka yajtami'a l-nāsu* 'I wait until the people's gathering at your place'. In the latter two cases, according to Hišām, both *naṣb* and *raf'* are possible, but *raf'* is better.²⁰⁷

Al-Suyūṭī notes al-Axfaš's, Ibn al-Sarrāj's and Hišām's views presented above and some of their examples.²⁰⁸

11. THE ACTION WHICH THE VERB PRECEDING ḤATTĀ DENOTES TAKES PLACE GRADUALLY UNTIL THE OCCURRENCE OF THE ACTION DENOTED BY THE FOLLOWING VERB

11.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi does not mention this issue.

11.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not explicitly discuss this issue in his *Ma'ānī*. Nevertheless, his concern with the question of whether the verb preceding *ḥattā* denotes a durative action (see §3.2.1) may be connected to the idea, discussed by

²⁰⁵ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 165, 1–21.

²⁰⁶ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 166, 9–12. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1667, 13–15, where the author provides a concise description of the discussion. Al-Astarābādī quotes Ibn al-Sarrāj but attributes to al-Axfaš the same opinion with regards to 'aw. See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 61, 11–62, 1; cf. chapter 5, §5.3.

²⁰⁷ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1667, 15–1668, 1; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 84, 4–6.

²⁰⁸ See al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 116, 6–14.

later grammarians, that the action denoted by this verb is of a gradual nature (see below).

11.3. *Other grammarians*

Al-Zamaxšarī notes that the action denoted by the verb preceding *ḥattā* takes place gradually until the occurrence of the action denoted by the following verb.²⁰⁹ Ibn al-Ḥājjib, al-Astarābādī and al-Suyūṭī also mention this.²¹⁰ It is worth noting that they do not link this characteristic of *ḥattā* to the mood of the following verb and that they all mention it in their discussion of *ḥattā* which functions as a *ḥarfjarr*. In addition, some grammarians also characterize the action denoted by the verb preceding *ʿaw* as occurring gradually, when this conjunction is followed by *našb* (see chapter 5, §3.3.3).

12. CONCLUSION: AN ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN *RAF* ^ʿ AND *NAŠB* FOLLOWING *ḤATTĀ*

12.1. *The theory of the speaker's intention*

One of the main points in the discussion of *ḥattā* is the question of when the following verb should take *raf* ^ʿ and when *našb*. This issue has been discussed at length in this chapter; here is a concise description of the prevalent views.

In his *Kitāb* Sibawayhi presents a comprehensive and complex theory of *ḥattā* and its meanings when followed by an imperfect verb (see §3.1). According to this theory, there are two sentence types in which this verb is *manšūb* and two sentence types in which it takes *raf* ^ʿ:

- a. In one sentence type with *našb*, *ḥattā* has the meaning of *ʿilā ʿan* and the following verb denotes the *ḡāya*. Sibawayhi's example for this sentence type is *sirtu ḥattā ʿadxulahā* 'I walked until the point of entering it', which means the same as *sirtu ʿilā ʿan ʿadxulahā*.
- b. In the other sentence type with *našb*, *ḥattā* has the meaning of *kay* and the action of the verb following *ḥattā* has not yet occurred. Sibawayhi's example for this sentence type is *kallamtuhu ḥattā yaʿmura lī bišayʿin*

²⁰⁹ See al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 131, 16–18.

²¹⁰ See Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Šarḥ* II, 207, 10–14; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 281, 9–12; al-Suyūṭī, *ʿItqān* (1901) I, 162, 7; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 165, 1–3.

‘I spoke to him in order that he would command [to bring] me something’.

- c. In one sentence type with *rafʿ*, the action of the verb following *ḥattā* takes place immediately after the action of the verb that precedes *ḥattā*, and both actions must have taken place in the past. An example of this sentence type is *sirtu ḥattā ʿadxuluhā* ‘I walked and indeed I entered it’, a sentence which conveys the fact that there was an action of entering which occurred immediately after the action of walking.
- d. In the other sentence type with *rafʿ*, the action of the verb following *ḥattā* does not occur immediately after the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā*. Here the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* must have taken place in the past, whereas the action of the verb following *ḥattā* occurs in the present. Often the appropriate translation of *ḥattā* in this case is ‘so ... that’, as in *marīḍa ḥattā lā yarjūnahu* ‘he was so sick, that they (i.e. the people) lose hope regarding him’.

Al-Farrāʾ presents a totally different theory (see §3.2). Unlike Sībawayhi, who sees a connection between the meanings of *ḥattā* and the mood of the following verb, al-Farrāʾ’s theory has two guiding principles which should be taken into account when determining the mood of the verb following *ḥattā*: (1) whether the verb preceding *ḥattā* denotes a durative action; (2) the time of the verb following *ḥattā*. According to al-Farrāʾ there are three sentence types in which an imperfect verb follows *ḥattā*:

- a. In the first sentence type the verb preceding *ḥattā* is in the perfect form *faʿala* and not durative, and the verb following *ḥattā* takes *rafʿ* and denotes an action in the past. Al-Farrāʾ’s example for this sentence type is *jīʾtu ḥattā ʿakūnu maʿaka qarīban* ‘I came and I was close to you’.
- b. In the second sentence type the verbs preceding and following *ḥattā* are both durative and denote actions in the past, and the latter is *manṣūb*. Al-Farrāʾ’s example for this sentence type is *jaʿala fulānun yudīmu l-naẓara ḥattā yaʿrifaka* ‘so-and-so started and went on looking towards you in order that he might identify you’.
- c. In the third sentence type the verb following *ḥattā* denotes an action in the future and takes *naṣb*, whether the preceding verb is durative or not. Al-Farrāʾ exemplifies this sentence type with two Qurʾānic verses, one of which is *falan ʿabraha l-ʿarḍa ḥattā yaʿdana lī ʿabī* ‘I will not leave the land until my father gives me leave’ (Qurʾān 12:80).

Most grammarians adopt Sibawayhi's view, which they attempt to explain and elucidate, apparently because of the complexity of Sibawayhi's explanations, as well as a desire to create a simple distinction between the two moods of the verb following *ḥattā*.

One of the most salient distinctions by later grammarians concerning the mood of the verb following *ḥattā* is that *naṣb* is used when the verb following *ḥattā* indicates the future, whereas *rafʿ* serves to indicate the present (see §4.3.1). Some argue that in either mood the time of the verb following *ḥattā* may be relative or absolute: in the case of *naṣb*, the future may be relative to the time of the occurrence of the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* (relative future) or to the time of speech (absolute future). Similarly, in the case of *rafʿ*, the present may be relative to the time of the occurrence of the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā* (relative or historical present, which the grammarians call *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiya*) or to the time of speech (absolute present); see §§3.3.1.1–3.3.1.2. This theory is an attempt to cope with examples in which clearly the verbs preceding and following *ḥattā* both indicate past tense, while the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood. Such an example is *sirtu ʿamsi ḥattā ʿadxulahā wax-arajtu minhā l-yawma* (translated and discussed in §3.3.1.2; for a reference see note 69 there).

The main problem with the above distinction is that it cannot serve as a definitive criterion for distinguishing between the *naṣb* and *rafʿ* moods, but only as an explanation for some of the examples in which the verb following *ḥattā* takes the *naṣb* mood. The reason is that the verb following *ḥattā*, be it in *naṣb* or *rafʿ*, indicates an action that occurs after the action of the verb preceding *ḥattā*. This is explicitly noted by al-Astarābādī, who adds that the distinction between the two moods is strongly connected to the speaker's intention and to the question of what he wishes to express (see §4.3.2): the *naṣb* mood can indicate either an action which has not yet occurred (that is, absolute future) or one of which the speaker wants to say that it is meant to occur, without implying whether it has in fact occurred or not; the *rafʿ* mood, on the contrary, indicates that the action has occurred in the past or is occurring in the present and the speaker's intention is to indicate that it has indeed occurred or is currently occurring.

I find al-Astarābādī's explanation convincing, since it fits both Sibawayhi's theory of the four sentence types following *ḥattā* and the examples from the living language. It also corresponds to similar characteristics of other particles, following which the verb may appear in *naṣb*

and in *rafʿ*, such as *fa-*: the *naṣb* mood represents the speaker's uncertainty as to the occurrence of the action denoted by the verb, whereas the *rafʿ* mood, on the contrary, represents the speaker's certainty as to its occurrence (see §4.1-b above and note 115 there).

12.2. Ḥattā's "in between" status: between a simple adverb with no syntactic effect and a word which is syntactically related to the following *manṣūb* verb

Beginning with Sībawayhi grammarians have described the use of the *naṣb* and *rafʿ* moods following *ḥattā*. The former represents a syntactic dependency of the *manṣūb* verb on *ḥattā*; according to the prevalent view the *naṣb* mood is due to an 'an *muḍmara* and this 'an with the following *manṣūb* verb is taken as occupying the syntactic position of a *majrūr* noun due to the influence of *ḥattā*, considered a *ḥarf jarr* (see §9). The *rafʿ* mood following *ḥattā*, on the other hand, represents a lack of dependence of the *marfūʿ* verb on *ḥattā*; here it is considered one of the *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʿ* which have no syntactic influence (see §§3.1.2.1–3.1.2.2). The above-described use of the *naṣb* and *rafʿ* moods following *ḥattā*, as well as the various involved theories created to clarify them, reflect a complex syntactic situation. To this complexity one can add the evidence for dialectal differences in usage, according to which already in early times some speakers always put the verb following *ḥattā* in *naṣb* (see §3.3.6).

It is my belief that the complex linguistic situation of *ḥattā* can be linked to the historical development of its functions and the above-mentioned dialectal differences. The usage of *ḥattā* as an adverb with no syntactic influence on the following verb, with the meanings 'even' and 'finally' (see §§12.2.1–12.2.2 below), was in all likelihood the basis for instances where *ḥattā* was taken as syntactically unconnected to the following *marfūʿ* verb. However, *ḥattā* began to be conceived as an element on which the following verb depends syntactically and thus takes *naṣb*. Perhaps *ḥattā*'s "in between" status, between an adverb with no syntactic effect to a word which is syntactically related to the following verb, is also somewhat responsible for the occurrence of both *manṣūb* and *marfūʿ* verbs following it (cf. the similar case of *ʾidan* in chapter 4, §§9–10).

12.2.1. The adverb 'even'

As mentioned at the end of §3.4.2.1 Lipiński mentions the various meanings of *ḥattā* and adds that its use as an adverb in the sense of 'even' is reflected in sentences in which the following verb takes *rafʿ*. In other

words, this use can serve as an explanation for the *raf*‘ mood of the following verb.

12.2.2. *The adverb ‘finally’*

As mentioned in §3.4.2.2 Fleischer, Reckendorf and Fischer explain why the best translation of *hattā* in some contexts is ‘finally’. While they do not explicitly say so, it is possible that there is a connection between this meaning and the other instances in which the verb following *hattā* takes *raf*‘; *hattā* often functions as an adverb in the sense of ‘finally’, and similarly to its occurrence in the sense of ‘even’ (see §12.2.1 above), it does not have any syntactic effect on the following verb.

CHAPTER NINE

Li-

1. INTRODUCTION

Li- is another particle that is followed by a *manṣūb* verb under certain conditions. The early grammarians Sībawayhi and al-Farrā' as well as modern researchers discuss it only rather briefly, while later grammarians tend to discuss it more extensively.

The uses of *li-* followed by a verb in *naṣb* can be divided into four kinds: *lām kay*, *lām al-juḥūd*, *lām al-ʿāqiba/al-ṣayrūra* and *li-* in the structure of *ʾurīdu li(ʾan) tafʿala* (see §§2–5, respectively).

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi has no separate chapter in his *Kitāb* on *li-*. Where he mentions cases of *li-* followed by *naṣb* he is mainly concerned with whether the mood is due to *ʾan muḍmara* and whether it is possible to pronounce *ʾan* following this particle (see §8.1 and §9.1, respectively). Sībawayhi refers to three kinds of *li-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb: *lām kay*, *lām al-juḥūd* and *li-* in the structure *ʾurīdu li(ʾan) tafʿala* (see §2.1, §3.1 and §5.1, respectively). He does not discuss the use of *li-* which later grammarians call *lām al-ʿāqiba/al-ṣayrūra* (see §4).

1.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', like Sībawayhi, does not discuss *li-* at length. In his *Maʿānī* I was unable to find any reference to the two issues which concern Sībawayhi (see above). Al-Farrā' refers to four kinds of *li-* which can be followed by a verb in *naṣb*, and also to the pronunciation of this particle with *fathā*, i.e. as *la-* (see §7.2).

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Not all grammarians mention all four kinds of *li-*. Most refer to *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd*, and some discuss all four kinds either briefly¹ or

¹ See, for example, Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ ʿumda*, 334, 7–335, 3; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 317–318.

extensively.² Al-Zajjājī devotes a whole book to *li-* (al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*), in which he discusses various uses of this particle in Arabic, including *li-* preceding a verb in *naṣb*.

2. *LĀM KAY* 'LI-' [WITH THE MEANING] OF *KAY* "IN ORDER TO"

2.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi has no specific name for this kind of *li-*, which he calls simply *al-lām*. Sometimes he denotes it by means of an example, e.g. *al-lām allatī fī qawlika ji'tuka liṭaf'ala* 'the *li-* which [occurs] in *ji'tuka liṭaf'ala* 'I came to you in order that you do [something]'.³

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' calls this kind of *li-* *lām kay*.⁴

2.3. *Other grammarians*

Al-Mubarrad, like Sībawayhi, has no specific term for this kind of *li-*, but classifies it as *li-* of *mawḍi' al-'ijāb* 'a position of [an utterance of] affirmation' (contrary to *li-* which occupies *mawḍi' al-naḍy* 'a position of [an utterance of] negation', known as *lām al-juḥūd*; see §3.3).⁵ In this dichotomy al-Mubarrad ignores the possibility that *lām kay* can follow a negative utterance (see §2.3.2).

Most grammarians call this kind of *li-* *lām kay* 'li- [with the meaning] of *kay*',⁶ *al-lām allatī fī ma'nā kay* 'li- in the sense of *kay*'⁷ or *lām al-ta'līl* 'li- of introducing the reason'.⁸

² See, for example, al-Murādī, *Janā*, 114–124; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 163–167; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qatr* (1963), 66–67; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šudūr*, 267–268.

³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 1; 362, 17.

⁴ See, for example, al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 113, 8; 285, 6; II, 319, 1–2.

⁵ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 7, 3–4.

⁶ See, for example, Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, 147, 3–4; Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 184, 6; 227, 5–7; al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 53–54; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 22, 6; 195, 1; 196, 5; al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 162, 1; al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 51, –4; al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 5–6; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufašṣal*, 110, 9; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 98, 3; 227, 1–3; II, 377, 1–6; al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*, 106–108.

⁷ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 300, 3–4; Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, 147, 9; al-Zubaydī l-İsbilī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 73, –4; al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 56, 11; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 312, 6; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) IX, 6138b, 8. Cf. al-Naḍr b. Šumayl, *Risāla*, 165, 9 (the tenth kind of *lām*), where the author uses the term *lām kay al-nāṣiba* 'li- [with the meaning] of *kay* which induces [the following verb to take] *naṣb*'.

⁸ See, for example, Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 334, 7–8; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 105, 2–5; 115, 6–7; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 317, 5; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šudūr*, 267, 16.

2.3.1. *The meaning of lām kay*

Most grammarians say no more about the meaning of *lām kay* than that it has the same meaning as *kay*. Some explain that the fact that *li-* and *kay* can be interchanged without changing the meaning of the sentence proves that these two particles share the same meaning.⁹ One of the early grammarians who explicitly explains the meaning of *li-* is al-Zajjājī: *wa'innamā tajr'u hādihi l-lāmu mubayyinatan sababa l-fi'li llaḍi qablahā* 'this *li-* occurs in order to clarify the reason for the action [denoted by the verb] preceding it'.¹⁰ Ibn Fāris has a similar explanation: *li-* occurs in order to indicate 'irāda 'desire', as in *qumtu l'adriba Zaydan* 'I stood in order to hit Zayd', which means *qumtu 'urīdu ḍarbahu* 'I stood wanting to hit him'.¹¹ Al-Ḥarīrī also has a short and clear explanation: *wa'ammā l-lāmu llatī bima'nā kay fahiya 'ayḍan lil-ta'lili miṭāluhu ji'tu litukrimanī fa'illatu l-majī'i huwa ṭalabu l-'ikrāmi* 'as for *li-* in the sense of *kay*, it, too, [occurs like *kay*] for introducing the reason, as in *ji'tu litukrimanī* 'I came in order that you honor me', since the reason for the coming is the request of honoring'.¹²

2.3.2. *Can lām kay follow a negative verb?*

Most grammarians do not address this question. Two exceptions are al-Suhaylī and Ibn Rušd. Al-Suhaylī mentions an opinion attributed to one al-Ṣaymarī¹³ that *lām kay* cannot follow a negative utterance, but argues that it can follow both positive and negative verbs because its meaning, 'illa, is retained in either case. Ibn Rušd shares al-Suhaylī's view and provides two examples: *qāma Zaydun liyaḡḡdaba 'Amrun* 'Zayd stood in order that 'Amr become angry' and *mā qāma Zaydun liyaḡḡdaba 'Amrun* 'Zayd did not stand in order that 'Amr become angry'.¹⁴

Lam kay following a negated verb in fact appears in the Qur'ān: *mā ji'nā linuḡsida fī l-'arḍi* 'we did not come in order to work corruption in the land' (Qur'ān 12:73). One grammarian even cites this verse as an example

⁹ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 426, 5–6; al-Zajjājī, *Ma'ānī* (1994) III, 173, –1–174, 2. Cf. al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 407b, 8–10.

¹⁰ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 54, 9–10. Cf. Ibn al-Ḥajīb, 'Amālī II, 753, 8–10 (part of 'imlā' 64); Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1659, 11 (also quoted in al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 140, 5–6).

¹¹ See Ibn Fāris, *Ṣāhibī*, 113, 9–10.

¹² See al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 312, 6–7. Cf. al-Ardabīlī, *Šarḥ*, 101, 6–7. See also al-Suhaylī's definition and Ibn Ya'īš's similar explanation in al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*, 106, 11–12; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 929, 8–10.

¹³ Probably Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī b. Ishāq al-Ṣaymarī (see appendix B, §2.76).

¹⁴ See al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*, 106, 12–13; Ibn Rušd, *Ḍarūrī*, 129, 3 last lines. Cf. al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 225, 14–15.

of *lām kay*,¹⁵ and indeed there are no grounds for the opinion that *lām kay* should appear only after positive verbs.

3. *LĀM AL-JUHŪD*

3.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi has no term to denote this kind of *li-*, to which he refers by using an example sentence in which it occurs: *mā kāna liyaf'ala* 'he was not [such a person] to do [something]'.¹⁶ In his discussion of this sentence's *taqdīr* structure Sībawayhi says that it is the negation of its positive counterpart *kāna sayaf'alu* 'he was [such a person] to do [something]', exactly as *lan yaf'ala* 'he will not do [something]' is the negation of its positive counterpart *sayaf'alu* 'he will do [something]'.¹⁷

3.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not discuss this kind of *li-* at length, but refers to its meaning in his discussion of a Qur'ānic verse with the structure *mā kāna 'an yaf'ala*: *wamā kāna hādā l-Qur'ānu 'an yuftarā* 'This Qur'ān could not have been invented' (Qur'ān 10:37). Al-Farrā' explains that the meaning of the structure *mā kāna 'an yaf'ala* is *mā kāna yanbaġi 'an yaf'ala* 'it was not suitable [for him] to do [such a thing]'¹⁸ and adds that a corresponding structure is *mā kāna liyaf'ala*, as in *wamā kāna l-mu'minūna liyanfirū kāffatan* 'the believers were not such to go forth totally' (Qur'ān 9:122).¹⁹

3.3. *Other grammarians*

Some grammarians and lexicographers do not mention this kind of *li-* at all, either in their discussions of the kinds of *li-* in Arabic or in reference

¹⁵ See al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 182, 1–4.

¹⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 19–20.

¹⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 21–23. For the discussion of *lan* see chapter 2, §4.

¹⁸ The translation is taken from Lane, *Lexicon* I, 232a, –8ff.

¹⁹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 464, 6–9. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *Trāb* II, 255, 1–2, where al-Farrā' is partly quoted.

to the *naṣb* mood.²⁰ Most sources that do discuss it call it *lām al-juḥūd*,²¹ and a few use the name *lām al-jaḥd*²² (an even less frequent term is *lām al-tawkid*; see §3.3.3). Al-Mubarrad, as mentioned in §2.3, classifies it as *li-* which has *mawḍiʿ al-naḥy* ‘a position of [an utterance of] negation’.²³

Ibn Jinnī and al-Saxāwī call it *lām kay*. In other words, they do not distinguish between *li-* in the sense of *kay* and the kind introduced here, despite their different meanings.²⁴ Perhaps this lies in the fact that *li-* is *ḥarfjarr* in both cases.²⁵ To prevent ambiguity I shall consistently refer to the *li-* discussed here as *lām al-juḥūd*.

3.3.1. The differences between *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd*

Al-Suhaylī dedicates most of his chapter on the kinds of *li-* to the differences between *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd*. Here are the six differences which he mentions and explains:²⁶

- a. *Lām al-juḥūd* must be preceded by a negation of the verb *kāna*: *mā kāna* or *lam yakun* (see also §3.3.2 below).
- b. This verb must either be in the past form or indicate the past, but not the future.

²⁰ See al-Naḍr b. Šumayl, *Risāla*, 165, 5–12 and al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 407–414, where fourteen kinds of *li-* are mentioned, but not *lām al-juḥūd*. Al-Fārisī in his *ʿIḍāḥ* and his commentator al-Jurjānī do not mention *lām al-juḥūd* among the particles following which the verb can be *manṣūb*. See al-Fārisī, *ʿIḍāḥ* II, 1049–1089 (these pages consist of al-Jurjānī’s commentary, too). Likewise, the long discussions of the kinds of *li-* in Ibn Fāris’ *Šāḥibī* do not treat *lām al-juḥūd*. See Ibn Fāris, *Šāḥibī*, 112–116 (*bāb al-lām*).

²¹ See, for example, Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, 147, 5; Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 228, 1–6, where the author explains this term: *wama’nā l-juḥūdi ʿidḫālu ḥarfi l-jaḥdi ʿalā l-kalāmi* ‘and the meaning of *juḥūd* [in the term *lām al-juḥūd*] is the insertion of a negation particle into the utterance (i.e. *mā* or *lam* that negate *kāna* and *yakun*, respectively)’. al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 55–59; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 22, 7; 195, 1; 196, 6–9; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 73, –4; al-Rummānī, *Manāzil*, 51, 2 last lines; al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾij*, 106–108. See also al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* I, 485, –1–486, 1; Ibn Muʿṭī, *ʿAlfīyya*, 9, 3; Ibn Muʿṭī, *Fuṣūl*, 203, 7; al-Irbīlī, *Jawāḥir*, 80, 8; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 167, 8; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 373, –4.

²² See al-Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf*, 45, –1; al-Rummānī, *Maʾānī*, 100, 4; al-Jawḥarī, *Tāj* II, 336, 30; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 693, 11; al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 312, 7–8; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) IX, 6138b, 11; al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 81, 1.

²³ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 7, 3–4.

²⁴ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 328, –1–329, 1; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 373, –4––3.

²⁵ Al-Šanʿānī presents another argument which links these two kinds of *li-*. He explains that the meaning of *lām al-juḥūd* is indeed negation (*juḥūd*), but some claim that its original meaning is of a goal (*ḡaraḍ*), because it is actually identical with *lām kay*. Accordingly, he goes on to say, the *taqḍīr* structure of *mā kuntu liʾaštumaka* ‘I was not [such a person as] to curse you’ is *mā jaʿaltu ḡaraḍi šatmaka* ‘I did not make it my goal to curse you’. See al-Šanʿānī, *Tahḍīb*, 241, 2–4.

²⁶ See al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾij*, 106, 14–107, to end.

- c. It must denote only time and not existence. In other words, it must be *kāna l-nāqiṣa* and not *kāna l-tāmma* (the latter indicates both time and existence).²⁷
- d. The subject of the sentence must not be followed by an adverb, as in the ungrammatical sentence **mā kāna Zaydun 'indaka liyaḏhaba* 'Zayd, being at your place, was not [such a person] to walk away'.²⁸
- e. The agent of the *maṣṣūb* verb following *lām al-juḥūd* must be an attached pronoun which refers to the subject of the sentence. The following sentence is thus ungrammatical: **mā kāna Zaydun liyaḏhaba 'Amrun* 'Zayd was not [such a person] that 'Amr walks away'. Al-Suhaylī emphasizes that the utterance introduced by *lām al-juḥūd* has the status of a predicate which must refer to the subject.²⁹
- f. 'An can appear following *lām kay* but not following *lām al-juḥūd* (see §9).

The following are three additional conditions for the use of *lām al-juḥūd* which Abū Ḥayyān adds and which can also be inferred from the above-mentioned six points:

- g. *Lām al-juḥūd* must be preceded by a verbal sentence, not only a noun. The following line of poetry: *famā jam'un liyaḡliba jam'a qawmī / muqāwamatan walā fardun lifardi* 'there is no [such] group that [can] overcome the group of my people in a [mass] battle or in a duel' is thus an exception.³⁰ In this verse a noun precedes *lām al-juḥūd* and not a verbal sentence; Abū Ḥayyān explains this by several *taqdīr* structures, one of which is *famā kāna jam'un liyaḡliba*.³¹
- h. A negative utterance must be used in conjunction with *lām al-juḥūd*, but not a seemingly negative utterance which actually has a positive

²⁷ For a reference to these terms see chapter 8, note 184.

²⁸ Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1661, 4–5.

²⁹ Abū Ḥayyān formulates precisely the same condition on the authority of Abū 'Abdallāh b. Hišām al-Fihri, the author of *al-Muqarrib*. According to *Kašf al-zunūn* it is Ibn Hišām Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, the author of *al-Muqarrib fi l-naḥw* (d. 570 AH). Abū Ḥayyān adds that to the best of his knowledge only this grammarian conceived and formulated this point, but as can be clearly seen here, al-Suhaylī already mentions this point. See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1659, 7–10 and note 3.

³⁰ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by 'Amr b. Ma'di Karib.

³¹ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1659, 4–7; 1661, 9–14. Cf. al-Murādī, *Janā*, 117, 7–11; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 164, 4–6; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 198, –2–199, 1. Brockelmann states that the use of *lām al-juḥūd* in short nominal sentences is possible but rare. See Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 539, 11–13; 539, 18–19 (part of §348.c).

meaning, such as the ungrammatical example **mā kāna Zaydun 'illā liyaḍriba* 'Amran 'Zayd was no other than [such as] to hit 'Amr'.³²

- i. *Kay* must not be used instead of *li-*, as in the ungrammatical example **mā kāna Zaydun kay yaḍriba* 'Amran 'Zayd was not [such as] to hit 'Amr'.³³

Most grammarians elucidate the use of *lām al-juḥūd* in ways which correspond to the nine above-mentioned points.

3.3.2. *The negative particles used in conjunction with lām al-juḥūd*

Most grammarians mention the negative particle *mā* used in the structure *mā kāna liyaḍ'ala* and some mention *lam*, too, which is used in the structure *lam yakun liyaḍ'ala*.³⁴ Grammarians disagree about the negative particle *'in*.³⁵ Most of their discussions concern a Qur'ānic verse with the structure *'in kāna liyaḍ'ala: waqad makarū makrahum wa'inda llāhi makruhum wa'in kāna makruhum litazūla minhu l-jibālu* 'they plotted their plot, but their plot is in the hands of God and it is not such whereby the mountains should be moved' (Qur'an 14:46). This translation corresponds to the explanation of some grammarians, starting from al-Farrā', that *'in* in this verse is a negative particle used with *lām al-juḥūd*.³⁶ Others, like al-Zajjājī, object to this explanation and claim that the only negative particles which can be used in conjunction with *lām al-juḥūd* are *mā* and *lam*, but not *'in*.³⁷ They also emphasize that if the utterance is positive or

³² See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1661, 5–6.

³³ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1661, 6–7.

³⁴ See, for example, al-Jawharī, *Tāj* II, 336, 30; al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*, 106, 15; Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 365, 5 last lines; Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 230, 10; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 23, 1–3; al-Ḫwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumāl*, 182, 5–6; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 163, 19.

³⁵ See, for example, al-Murādi, *Janā*, 116, 5 last lines, where the author says that according to the prevalent opinion only *mā* and *lam* can be used with *lām al-juḥūd*, but adds that it is also possible to use *'in*.

³⁶ See, for example, al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 79, 8–13; al-Zajjājī, *Ma'ānī* (1994) III, 166, –3–167, 8; al-Naḥḥās, *T'rāb* II, 372, 10–373, 7. Cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 328, 4 last lines; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 144, 10–12 (part of *mas'ala* 151); Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* II, 227, 3 last lines; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *Amālī* I, 260, –1–261, 1; al-Murādi, *Janā*, 117, 1–2.

³⁷ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 179, 7–8. Al-Zajjājī suggests that *'in* in this verse is to be understood as *'in al-muxaffafa min al-taqila*, i.e. *'in* which occurs with the meaning of *'inna*, and that *li-* in *litazūla* is *lām kay*. The translation of the relevant part of the verse would then be 'their plot was in order that the mountains be moved because of it'. For the whole discussion see *ibid.*, 179–180.

A third possible way of understanding *wa'in* in this verse is as 'though' (see Wright, *Grammar* II, 40, 2–6 (part of §17)). The translation of the relevant part of the verse would be 'though their plot were such whereby the mountains should be moved'.

negated by a negative particle other than *mā* or *lam*, it cannot be considered as a case of *lām al-juḥūd*.³⁸

3.3.3. *The view that lām al-juḥūd emphasizes the negative meaning*

As mentioned above, a less common term for this kind of *li-* is *lām al-tawkīd* ‘*li-* of the emphasis’.³⁹ Two other similar terms are *al-lām al-mu’akkida* ‘the emphatic *li-*’⁴⁰ and *al-lām lita’kīd ma’nā l-naḥy* ‘the *li-* for emphasizing the meaning of negation’.⁴¹ Al-Jurjānī, who uses two of these three terms, explains that the negation in the structure *mā kāna liyaf’ala* is stronger than in *mā kāna yaf’alu*. He subsequently says that the meaning of the sentence *mā kuntu li’adribaka* is *mā kuntu mimman yakūnu lahu ‘irādatu ‘an yaḍribaka* ‘I was not [one] of those who have a desire to hit you’, and in this case the action of hitting does not form a part of the speaker’s customs and habits. The meaning of the sentence *mā kuntu ‘adribuka* ‘I was not used to hitting you’, on the other hand, is that the action of hitting could have come from the speaker. Al-Jurjānī says that according to this principle Qur’ān 8:33 is to be interpreted as follows: *mā kāna llāhu liyu’addibahum wa’anta fihim* ‘God was not [such as] to punish them while you were among them’.⁴²

4. *LĀM AL-‘ĀQIBA/AL-ŠAYRŪRA*

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi does not refer at all to this kind of *li-*, which he probably does not distinguish from *lām kay*.

³⁸ Some grammarians mention a number of negative particles that cannot be used in conjunction with *lām al-juḥūd*, in their opinion; see al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 80, 8–11; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufašṣal* III, 226, 15–19; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1656, 7–9; Ibn ‘Aqīl, *Musā’id* III, 78, 8–10; al-Makkūḍī, *Šarḥ* II, 693, 9–12; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 199, 2–4; al-Azhārī, *Taṣrīḥ* II, 371, 3–4; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham* IV, 109, 2 last lines; al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*, 781a, –5–3.

³⁹ See al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*, 83, 6–7.

⁴⁰ See al-Zamaxṣārī, *Mufašṣal*, 110, 11. Cf. al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 75, 8–9; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *‘Amālī* I, 260, 3 last lines.

⁴¹ See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 152, 8–9; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 178, –1; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 163, 18.

⁴² See al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 152, 10–to end. Cf. al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-mufašṣal* III, 226, 12–14; Ibn al-Ḥājjib, *‘Amālī* II, 543 (‘*imlā*’ 47); al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 62, 13–16.

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', too, does not explicitly refer to this kind of *li-*. In his commentary on Qur'an 10:88, in which a *li-* of this kind occurs according to many grammarians (see §4.3 below), he refers to it as *lām kay*, without commenting on its meaning there.⁴³

4.3. *Other grammarians*

Some early grammarians, among them al-Axfaš and al-Zajjāj, say that the meaning of this kind of *li-* together with the following imperfect verb, is similar to that of *fa-* followed by a perfect verb. In other words, the meaning of the utterance *liyaf'ala* is similar to that of *fa'fa'ala*. This explanation, which attributes to *li-* the meaning of *fa-* denoting a result, also clarifies the common term used to denote this *li-*: *lām al-'āqiba* 'li- of the result' (see §4.3.1). Al-Axfaš and al-Zajjāj use the verse mentioned in the previous section as an example: *rabbanā liyaḍillū 'an sabīlaka* (Qur'an 10:88). They emphasize that *li-* in this verse does not convey the goal of the action denoted by the main verb, but rather the result of this action. Thus, the meaning of the utterance *liyaḍillū 'an sabīlaka* is *faḍallū 'an sabīlaka* 'and they went astray from your way' (according to al-Axfaš) or *fa'aṣārahū dālika* 'ilā l-ḍalāli' 'and this made them go astray' (according to al-Zajjāj).⁴⁴ Al-Zajjāj explains that this meaning is similar to that of *'innamā kasaba fulānūn liḥatfihi* 'this and this earned [and this thing led] to his death', said of a person who earned much, but this also made him perish. Al-Zajjāj clearly says that this sentence in no way implies that the person wanted to earn in order to die, and subsequently provides a similar example.

Ibn Šuqayr discusses this kind of *li-* at length. He calls it *al-lām allatī fi ma'nā l-fā'* 'li- in the sense of *fa-*' and gives as an example the sentence *'aḥsanta 'ilā Zaydin liyakfira ni'mataka* 'you treated Zayd well and he was ungrateful for your kindness' (the meaning of *liyakfira ni'mataka* is *faka-fara ni'mataka*). He then adduces examples from the Qur'an, including Qur'an 10:88 quoted above, and a line of poetry.⁴⁵

⁴³ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 477, 9–10. Cf. al-Azharī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 407b, 3 last lines, where al-Farrā's opinion is quoted, and al-Naḥḥās' view discussed in §4.3.1 (for a reference see note 52 below).

⁴⁴ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) II, 573, 6–9; al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1994) III, 30, –5–2; III, 154, 12–14. Cf. Ibn Fāris, *Šāḥibī*, 115, 17–18.

⁴⁵ See Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 234.

Al-Zajjājī devotes a separate chapter in his *Lāmāt* to this kind of *li-* and its meaning. He says that some confuse it with the *li-* that conveys purpose, although the two are quite distinct. Thus, in the sentence *ʾaʿdadtu hādhihi l-xaṣabata liyamūla l-hāʾiṭu faʿadʿamahu bihā* ‘I prepared the timber [out of fear] that the wall would incline and then I would strengthen it (i.e. the wall) using it (i.e. the wood)’, the speaker did not prepare the timber in order that the wall would incline. In other words, *li-* here does not indicate the purpose (like *lām kay*) but rather the result (*al-ʿāqiba*). Al-Zajjājī then quotes a Qurʾānic verse—extensively quoted by later grammarians in this context—and explains that the word *liyakūna* in it means *fakāna: faltaqaṭahu ʾālu Firʿawna liyakūna lahum ʿaduwwan waḥaznan* ‘the family of Pharaoh picked him out, and he was for them an enemy and a sorrow’ (Qurʾān 28:8).⁴⁶

Al-Suhaylī explains this kind of *li-* somewhat differently, as a *lām kay*, but one that does not convey the intention and desire of the subject of the sentence, but rather of the real instigator of the action, i.e. God. In al-Suhaylī’s own words: *fahiya mutaʿalliqatun bil-qadari waqaḍāʾi l-fiʿli* ‘since it (i.e. this *li-*) is related to the fate and predestination of the [action indicated by the] verb’. Thus, in Qurʾān 28:8 the utterance *liyakūna lahum ʿaduwwan* actually means *faʿala llāhu ḍālika liyakūna kaḍā wakaḍā* ‘God did it in order that so-and-so would happen’, i.e. the result was that so-and-so happened. Al-Suhaylī also quotes in this context two Ḥadīṯ in which this kind of *li-* occurs; the first of these is *ʾuʿniqa liyamūta* ‘he marched quickly and in long steps and he finally died’, where the meaning is *qaddara* [*llāhu*] *ʾan yuʿniqa l-rajulu liyamūta* ‘God predestined that the man would march quickly and in long steps in order that he would die’, i.e. the result was that he eventually died.⁴⁷

4.3.1. *The terms used for this kind of li-: lām al-ʿāqiba and lām al-ṣayrūra*
The two common terms for this *li-* are *lām al-ʿāqiba* and *lām al-ṣayrūra*, both terms derived from the particle’s meaning, as explained below.

Al-Zajjājī is the earliest grammarian whom I found using the term *lām al-ṣayrūra*,⁴⁸ which literally means ‘*li-* of becoming’ a meaning related to

⁴⁶ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 125, 4–11. Cf. Ibn Fāris, *Šāhibī*, 115, 11–to end. For similar explanations of this Qurʾānic verse, see al-Aṣfaṣ, *Maʿānī* (1985) II, 573, 6–9; al-Zajjājī, *Maʿānī* (1994) III, 30, –4–2; 154, 12–14; IV, 133, 10–14; Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 234, 3–4; al-Zajjājī, *Hurūf*, 46, 1–2; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 227, –2–228, 3; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 268, 1–4.

⁴⁷ See al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾij*, 108, 1–7. For the context of this Ḥadīṯ see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) X, 274b, 11–16.

⁴⁸ See al-Zajjājī, *Maʿānī* (1994) III, 154, 12–14.

the view that what follows it represents the result of the main action, i.e. what the situation becomes. Al-Rummānī explains this idea using the above-mentioned Qurʾān 28:8, in which the utterance *liyākūna lahum ʿaduwwan* means *liyaṣīra lahum ʿaw faṣāra lahum ʿaduwwan* ‘and he became for them an enemy’.⁴⁹ According to some grammarians this term is used by the Kūfans.⁵⁰

Al-Zajjājī and al-Naḥḥās are the earliest grammarians in whose works I found the term *lām al-ʿāqiba* ‘li- of the result’.⁵¹ According to al-Naḥḥās it actually belongs to the *lām kay* type, but conveys the meaning of ‘*āqiba*. He adds that according to both al-Xalil and Sibawayhi, the explanation of the meaning of this *li-* is *lammā ʿāla ʿamruhum ʾilā hādā kāna kaʿannahu lihādā* ‘since their issue came to this point, it was as if [it were] for this’. Therefore, he explains, some refer to this *li-* as *lām al-ʿāqiba*, implying the result to which the issue came to.⁵² It should be noted that in al-Xalil’s and Sibawayhi’s books I found no such explanation, and it is therefore not clear where al-Naḥḥās found the above-mentioned sentence in the writings of these two grammarians.

As for the relation between the two terms *al-ṣayrūra* and *al-ʿāqiba*, al-Zajjājī says that in this context they are synonyms.⁵³

4.4. Secondary sources

Few modern scholars refer to this *li-*. Fleischer, one of the earliest, indicates that *li-* can occur with the meaning of *so dass, mit der Wirkung oder dem endlichen Erfolge dass* ‘so that, with the effect or the final result that’. He subsequently mentions the different terms used by grammarians to denote this *li-* (discussed in §4.3.1 above), and concludes with an interesting comparison between Arabic and German: such a particle, which originally conveys purpose, in order to denote the result, he says, is also found in German, both in serious discourse as well as in jokes and ironic utterances. He exemplifies the latter with *er kam gesund hierher, nur um bald*

⁴⁹ See al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 56, 16–17.

⁵⁰ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 125, 2; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 228, 4–5; II, 229, 11–14; al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 374, –2.

⁵¹ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 125–128.

⁵² See al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* II, 266, 5–7; 369, 2 last lines; III, 228, –1–229, 5.

The last explanation, involving the verb *ʿāla*, probably gave rise to the term *lām al-maʿāl* ‘li- of the result’ (*maʿāl* is the verbal noun of *ʿāla*), used by some later grammarians to denote this kind of *li-*. See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1660, 13–14; al-Murādī, *Janā*, 98, 5–7; 121, 3; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 165, 10; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 268, 1.

⁵³ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 128, 1–2. Cf. al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾij*, 108, 1.

darauf hier zu sterben ‘he came here well and sound, just in order to die here soon thereafter’. In the same way he explains Qur’ān 28:8.⁵⁴ Brockelmann, in a brief comment, similarly notes that the use of *li-*, which originally denotes a purpose, in order to convey an unintended result, is a sort of oxymoron. Like Fleischer he also quotes Qur’ān 28:8 in this context.⁵⁵

In his *WKAS* Ullmann succinctly states that this use of *li-* is not correct.⁵⁶ Why he thinks this is the case is not made clear at all.

5. *LI-* IN THE STRUCTURE *’URĪDU LI(’AN) TAF’ALA*

Grammarians mention two structures in which *li-* follows a verb which denotes desire, such as *’arāda* ‘to want’ and *’amara* ‘to command’. Sibawayhi refers to the structure in which *’an* follows *li-*, e.g. *’urīdu li’an taf’ala*, whereas al-Farrā’ discusses the structure without *’an*, e.g. *’urīdu litaf’ala*.

5.1. *Sibawayhi*

At the end of chapter 274 of the *Kitāb*, one of the chapters devoted to *’an*, Sibawayhi discusses the sentence *’urīdu li’an taf’ala* ‘I want [this] in order that you do [something]’. He asks one of his teachers⁵⁷ for the meaning of this sentence and is answered that it means *’irādatī lihādā* ‘My desire [for this] is for this [thing]’.⁵⁸ At the end of this discussion Sibawayhi quotes Qur’ān 39:12 which has a similar structure: *wa’umirtu li’an ’akūna ’awwala l-muslimīna* ‘and I have been commanded [to do so] in order that I be

⁵⁴ See Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 397–398; 533, –6–3.

⁵⁵ See Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, 539, 7–11 (part of §348.c).

⁵⁶ See Ullmann, *WKAS* II.1, 16b, 39–44.

⁵⁷ Although Sibawayhi does not explicitly say who this teacher is, he probably means his main teacher al-Xalīl. Al-Fārisī who discusses this sentence explicitly mentions al-Xalīl’s name. See al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 233, 1–2 (beginning of *mas’ala* 291).

⁵⁸ The sentence *’irādatī lihādā* can be understood in two different ways (as also reflected in some grammarians’ explanations; see §5.3 below):

- ‘My desire [of this] is for this [thing]’. Under this interpretation there is a missing direct object of *’urīdu*, and *lihādā* conveys the purpose of the action.
- ‘My desire is of this [thing]’, i.e. I desire this thing. According to this interpretation the overt *lihādā* is the logical direct object of the action of desire.

I tend to understand Sibawayhi’s words according to the former interpretation, which is also explicitly mentioned by one of his commentators: see Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 251, –4–252, 2. Cf. al-Murādi, *Janā*, 122, 3–6.

the first of the Muslims'. He explains that the meaning is equivalent to *wa'umirtu lihādā* 'I have been commanded [to do so] for this [thing]'.⁵⁹

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' refers to several Qur'ānic verses with a structure similar to that which Sībawayhi discusses, but in which *'an* does not follow *li-*. In reference to the verse *wa'umirnā linuslīmā lirabbi l-'ālamīna* 'and we are commanded to surrender to God' (Qur'ān 6:71), *al-Farrā'* states that the Bedouins say *'amartuka litaḍhaba* and *'amartuka 'an taḍhaba*, both meaning: 'I commanded you to go'.⁶⁰ In his commentary on *yurīdu llāhu liyubayyina lakum* 'God desires to make clear to you' (Qur'ān 4:26), *al-Farrā'* notes that the Bedouins say *'aradtu litaḍhaba* and *'aradtu 'an taḍhaba*, both meaning: 'I wanted you to go'.⁶¹ These two references show that according to *al-Farrā'* the subordinate clause following a verb which denotes desire can be introduced by either *li-* or *'an*. He adds that this *li-* is *lām kay* which is here interchangeable with *'an*.⁶² He explains that *li-* following verbs which denote desire can be used instead of *'an* because both particles necessitate that the following verb convey an action in the future and not in the past. He concludes that *li-* can replace *'an* also following other verbs, like *rajā* 'to request', which are similar to *'aradtu* and *'amartu* because they all require that the following verb occur in the future. As an example of this usage he quotes the line *'aḥāwala 'i'nātī bimā qāla 'am rajā / liyaḍḥaka minnī 'aw liyaḍḥaka šāḥibuh* 'did he try to ruin me with what he said or desired to laugh at me or [to make] his friend laugh [at me]?'.⁶³ *Al-Farrā'* emphasizes that it is impossible to use *li-* following other verbs which do not denote desire, like *ẓanna* 'to think', as in the ungrammatical sentence **ẓanantu litaqūma* 'I thought that you would rise'. The reason is that

⁵⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 428, 2–3. For similar explanations see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 36, 2 last lines; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqā* II, 270, 3–7. Cf. Wright, *Grammar* II, 28, 11–13; 28, 2 last lines (part of §15(b)).

⁶⁰ See *al-Farrā'*, *Ma'ānī* I, 339, 3 last lines.

⁶¹ See *al-Farrā'*, *Ma'ānī* I, 261, 11–13. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *Trāb* I, 447, 3 last lines, where *al-Farrā'* is quoted.

⁶² See *al-Farrā'*, *Ma'ānī* I, 220, 14–221, 2; 261–263. Cf. Abū Hayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1660, 5–8 and al-Murādī, *Janā*, 122, –1–123, 3, where this opinion is briefly mentioned. See also al-Kisā'ī, *Ma'ānī*, 85, 2–4; 132, 2 last lines, where it is mentioned that in *al-Baḥr al-muḥīt* this opinion is attributed not only to *al-Farrā'* but also to al-Kisā'ī.

⁶³ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by al-Anafī of the Banū Anaf al-Nāqa of the Banū Sa'd.

following *ḡanna* (and other verbs which do not denote desire) the verb can denote an action not only in the future but also in the past.⁶⁴

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Like al-Farrā', some early grammarians refer to the structure in which 'an does not follow *li-*, but unlike him they distinguish between *li-* in this structure and *lām kay*, and give the former the name *al-lām allatī fī ma'nā 'an 'li-* in the sense of 'an'. Ibn Šuqayr exemplifies this *li-* with three Qur'ānic verses, Qur'ān 6:71 (discussed in the previous section), 9:31 and 61:8.⁶⁵ Others, like al-Axfaš and al-Naḥḥās, agree with al-Farrā' that this *li-* is just *lām kay* which can be replaced by 'an'.⁶⁶ Al-Zajjājī says that some prefer to make the distinction between this *li-* and *lām kay* and some do not, but in any case everyone agrees on its meaning.⁶⁷

Al-Axfaš, al-Naḥḥās and other grammarians propose two explanations for the structure *yurīdu liyaf'ala*: (1) the direct object of *yurīdu* should be completed, so that the meaning would be *yurīdu [hādā l-šay'a] liyaf'ala* 'he wants [this thing] in order that he do [a thing]'; (2) *liyaf'ala* is the direct object of *yurīdu* and the meaning of the sentence is thus 'he wants to do [a thing]'. The former seems to correspond to Šibawayhi's view and the latter is identical to al-Farrā''s (see §5.1, especially note 58, and §5.2, respectively).⁶⁸

6. THE MOOD OF THE VERB FOLLOWING THE FOUR KINDS OF *LI-* DISCUSSED IN THE PRECEDING SECTIONS

6.1. *Šibawayhi*

Šibawayhi does not explicitly discuss the mood of the verb following *lām kay* or *lām al-juḥūd* discussed in §§2–3, but it is clear that in his view it is *manšūb*; he characterizes *li-* as one of the particles followed by a verb

⁶⁴ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 261, 15–263, 7. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* I, 447, –1–448, 1 and al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 374, 1–8, where al-Farrā''s words are quoted in part.

⁶⁵ See Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 235, 6–10. Cf. al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 374, 1.

⁶⁶ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) II, 492, –5–4; al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* II, 10, 4; 74, 10–13. Al-Mubarrad, too, is quoted by al-Zajjājī as holding this opinion. See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 152, 1–2.

⁶⁷ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 150, 5–9.

⁶⁸ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 350, –3–351, 5; 441, 1–5; al-Naḥḥās, *ʿIrāb* I, 448, 6–8. Cf. Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 251, –4–252, 2 and Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1660, 9–12, where the two authors express their support for the first explanation; Ibn Jinnī, *Muḥtasab* II, 31, 1–5; 32, 8–33, 1.

which takes *našb* due to the influence of 'an *muḍmara* and gives some examples of *li-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb.⁶⁹

6.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā', too, does not mention any other possible mood for verbs that follow the particle *li-* discussed in the previous sections.

6.3. *Other grammarians*

The vast majority of grammarians do not discuss the mood of the verb following the various kinds of *li-* discussed in §§2–5 above, probably because they thought it was obvious that the only possible mood was *našb*. One exception is Ibn Šuqayr, who claims that some speakers pronounce the verb following *li-* in *jazm*, as in the following line of poetry: *wa'ujdī 'alā 'ašyā'a minka liturḍinī / wa'ud'ā 'ilā mā sarraḳum fa'ujību* 'I ignore [some] things of yours in order that you please me, I am called to what made you happy and I comply'.⁷⁰ According to Ibn Šuqayr *jazama turḍinī bilāmi kay* '[the poet] put the verb *turḍinī* in *jazm* due to [the syntactic effect of] *lām kay*'.⁷¹ It should be nevertheless noted that the form *liturḍinī* can be due to poetic license and not to a dialectal characteristic. In fact, Ibn 'Uṣfūr quotes this verse as an example of poetic license and explains that the original form was *liturḍiyanī* (in *našb*), from which the final *yā'* was omitted.⁷²

7. THE PRONUNCIATION OF *LI-* WITH *FATHA* (*LA-*)

7.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi does not refer to the pronunciation of *lām kay* or *lām al-juḥūd* with *fatha*. As noted in a recent study, Sibawayhi only says that *lām al-jarr* should be pronounced with *kasra* before nouns in order to distinguish it from *lām al-ibtidā'* pronounced with *fatha*.⁷³

⁶⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 1–8; 362, 17.

⁷⁰ The author of this verse, in the *ṭawīl* meter, is unknown.

⁷¹ See Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 184, 3–6.

⁷² See Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Ḍarā'ir*, 91, 6–8, where the author says that this verse was quoted in al-Liḥyānī's *Nawādir*.

⁷³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 341, 12–16 (beginning of chapter 215). Cf. Janhawītšī, *Xilāf*, 331–333.

7.2. *Al-Farrā'*

According to al-Farrā' the Banū Tamīm pronounce *lām kay* with *fatḥa*, as in *ji'tu la'āxuḍa ḥaqqī* 'I came in order to take what belongs to me'. He states that this is an exceptional dialectal pronunciation.⁷⁴

7.3. *Other grammarians*

According to some grammarians *li-* followed by a verb in *naṣb* is always pronounced with *kasra*.⁷⁵ The lexicographer al-Azhari explains that this is due to the fact that its meaning is equivalent to *lām al-'idāfa*, i.e. the preposition *li-* which is pronounced with *kasra*. The examples he provides in this context are *ji'tu litaqūma* and *ji'tu liqiyāmika*, both of which mean 'I came in order that you stand'. In the former *li-* is *lām kay* and in the latter it is *lām al-'idāfa*.⁷⁶

Other grammarians present evidence that this particle when followed by a *maṣṣūb* verb is pronounced with *fatḥa*, i.e. *la-*:

- a. Al-Kisā'i is quoted by Ibn Jinnī as saying that he heard from a person named Abū Ḥizām al-'Uklī the sentence *mā kuntu la'ātiyaka* 'I was not [such a person] to come to you', in which the *lām* is pronounced with *fatḥa*.⁷⁷ The *lām* here is *lām al-juḥūd*.
- b. Al-Axfaš mentions some grammarians who have evidence for speakers who pronounce *lām kay* with *fatḥa*. He provides two lines of poetry as examples, the first heard by Yūnus and the second by Xalaf al-Aḥmar, who attributes this pronunciation to the dialect of the Banū l-'Anbar. The two verses are: (1) *yu'āmirunī Rabī'atu kulla yawmin / la'uhlikahu wa'aqtaniya l-dajjā* '[the people of the tribe of] Rabī'a consult with me every day in order that I kill him and buy chicken';⁷⁸ (2) *faqultu liKalbiyyay Quḍā'ata 'innamā / taxayyar Tumānī 'ahla Faljin la'amna'ā* 'I told the two [people named] Kalbī from [the tribe of] Quḍā'a: choose

⁷⁴ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 285, 2–6. Cf. al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 80, 6–7, where the author seems to quote al-Farrā' without explicitly mentioning his name.

⁷⁵ For grammarians who refer to *lām kay* only, see Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 227, 5–6; al-Naḥḥās, *Ṭarāb* III, 260, 5–6; al-Suyūṭī, *Ašbāḥ* (1998) II, 574, 3 last lines. For grammarians who refer to *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd*, see al-Ḥarīrī, *Šarḥ*, 312, 9; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) IX, 6138b, 8–to end; al-Šan'ānī, *Tahḍīb*, 244, 8–10. Al-Zajjāji refers to *lām kay*, *lām al-juḥūd* and *lām al-'āqiba/al-ṣayrūra*. See al-Zajjāji, *Ḥurūf*, 45, –2–46, 2.

⁷⁶ See al-Azhari, *Tahḍīb* XV, 407b, 11–12.

⁷⁷ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sīr* I, 328, –1–329, 1. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1661, 17.

⁷⁸ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by al-Namir b. Tawlab al-'Uklī.

Tumānī from the people of Falj in order that I defend!'.⁷⁹ Al-Axfaš subsequently adds that he himself heard some Bedouins pronouncing *lām kay* with *fathā*. He explains this pronunciation thus: 'aṣlu l-lāmi l-fathu 'the basic and primary [vowel of] *lām* is *fathā*', and only in an 'idāfa structure (when *lām* is *ḥarf jarr*) is it pronounced with *kasra*, in order to distinguish it from *lām al-ibtidā'* pronounced with *fathā* (cf. §7.1 above).⁸⁰

- c. Al-Nahḥās attributes to al-Kisā'ī, al-Farrā' and al-Axfaš the opinion that *lām al-'amr*, *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd* may be pronounced with *fathā*, without giving any more details or examples. According to al-Nahḥās Sibawayhi does not share this view.⁸¹
- d. Ibn Jinnī and some later grammarians quote a person named Abū Zayd⁸² who claims to have heard some speakers pronouncing a Qur'ānic verse with *lām al-juḥūd* with *fathā*: *mā kāna llāhu layu'addibahum wa'anta fihim* (Qur'ān 8:33; for a translation see §3.3.3, where this verse is discussed in a different context). Ibn Jinnī says about this evidence: *wahādā mina l-ṣudūdī biḥaytu lā yuqāsu 'alayhi* 'this is [one] of the exceptional phenomena from which no [generalizations] should be deduced'.⁸³
- e. Al-Astarābādī states that some speakers pronounce *li-* followed by 'an *muḍmara* with *fathā*, as in the example *laya'lama* 'in order that he know'.⁸⁴

This pronunciation has been attributed to four groups of speakers:

1. Banū 'Ukl. Among them are the person whom al-Kisā'ī quotes (see a. above) and the poet who declaimed the first verse quoted in b. above.
2. Banū l-'Anbar. As mentioned in b. above, Xalaf al-Aḥmar is the source of this attribution. Abū Ḥayyān states that Makkī b. Abī Ṭālib also attributed this pronunciation to the Banū l-'Anbar.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ The author of this verse, in the *ṭawīl* meter, is unknown.

⁸⁰ See al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 304, 8–305, 5. Cf. al-Nahḥās, *Ṭrāb* I, 239, –1–240, 1; al-Fārisi, *Baṣṛīyyāt* I, 550, 4–7 (beginning of *mas'ala* 59); Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 329, 3 last lines.

⁸¹ See al-Nahḥās, *Ṭrāb* I, 485, –1–486, 2.

⁸² Probably Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī, who died in 214/830 or 215/831. See *El'* I, 167, s.v. Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī, Sa'id b. Aws.

⁸³ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 330, 1. Cf. al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 80, 11–12; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1706, 2 last lines; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* II, 260, 6–8; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* II, 1864a, 12–14.

⁸⁴ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 290, 2 last lines. Cf. al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 252, –4–2; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1661, 15–17.

⁸⁵ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1706, –3.

3. Banū 'Ukl and Banū l-'Anbar. This attribution is due to Ibn Mālik.⁸⁶
4. Banū Tamīm. This is due to al-Farrā' (see §7.2 above) and al-Suyūṭī.⁸⁷

8. IS THERE AN 'AN MUḌMARA AFTER LI-?

8.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi maintains that the verb following *li-* is *maṣṣūb* not due to its direct effect but to an 'an muḍmara. In chapter 234 in his *Kitāb*, which is devoted to the particles following which 'an muḍmara is posited, Sibawayhi characterizes *li-* and *hattā* as such. According to him these two induce nouns to take *jarr* and thus cannot have a syntactic effect on verbs (in accordance with the principle of *al-'āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ*; see appendix A, §1.1). Sibawayhi adds that when one posits an 'an muḍmara following these particles, the utterance is grammatical since the compound 'an *yaf'ala* is equivalent to a noun in the *jarr* case.⁸⁸

Towards the end of this chapter Sibawayhi discusses the *taqdīr* structure of sentences with the structure *mā kāna liyaf'ala*. He says that the *taqdīr* of *mā kāna Zaydun liyaf'ala* 'Zayd was not [such a person] to do [something]' is *mā kāna Zaydun li'an yaf'ala* or *mā kāna Zaydun lihādā l-fi'li* 'Zayd was not [such a person] for this action'.⁸⁹

8.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not discuss this question in his *Ma'ānī*, but some grammarians attribute to the Kūfan school, of which he is considered one of the founders, the opinion that *li-* itself induces the following verb to take *naṣb* (see below).

8.3. *Other grammarians*

Baṣrans and Kūfans disagree on which 'āmil induces *naṣb* following *lām kay*. Al-Zajjājī, the first grammarian who mentions this dispute, says that according to the Baṣrans the verb following *li-* is *maṣṣūb* due to 'an muḍmara, whereas the Kūfans argue that *li-* itself has this syntactic

⁸⁶ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.1, 149, 6–9. Cf. Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1706, –3–2, where the author briefly mentions Ibn Mālik's opinion.

⁸⁷ See al-Suyūṭī, *Ham'* IV, 141, 8.

⁸⁸ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 1–8. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 700, 8–11, where the author explains Sibawayhi's words. See also Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 367, 1–2.

⁸⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 20–21. See also *ibid.*, 378, 7–9.

influence.⁹⁰ Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a chapter in his *ʿInṣāf* to this issue, whose concise description is presented in §8.3.3 below.

8.3.1. *The verb following li- takes naṣb due to ʿan muḍmara*

Many grammarians hold this opinion, which corresponds to Sībawayhi's⁹¹ and is attributed to the Baṣrans in general.⁹² Some explain it like Sībawayhi, but discuss *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd* separately.⁹³ Al-Zajjājī explicitly says that *ʿan muḍmara* should be posited following *lām al-ʿāqiba/al-ṣayrūra*, too,⁹⁴ and al-Astarābādī mentions a similar opinion on *li-* in the structure of *ʿurīdu liṭafʿala*.⁹⁵

8.3.2. *Li- directly induces the following verb to take naṣb*

In addition to al-Zajjājī (see the beginning of §8.3 above), other grammarians also attribute this opinion to the Kūfans.⁹⁶ The opinion and arguments of the Kūfans are presented in §8.3.3 below.

8.3.3. *The dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans as reflected in Ibn al-Anbārī's ʿInṣāf*

Ibn al-Anbārī devotes chapter 79 of his *ʿInṣāf* to this dispute;⁹⁷ here is a summary of the discussion. According to the Kūfans the verb following *li-* is *manṣūb* due to the direct effect of this particle, whereas the Baṣrans claim that *ʿan muḍmara* is the *ʿāmil* which induces *naṣb*. The Kūfans argue that since *li-* occupies the position of *kay* and has its meaning, the verb following *li-* is *manṣūb* due to its direct affect, just like the verb following *kay*

⁹⁰ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 53, 1–4.

⁹¹ See, for example, al-Axfaš, *Maʿānī* (1985) I, 300, 3–7; al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* IV, 84, 8–12; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 150, 9–11; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*, 79, 4–5; al-Sīrāfi, *Šarḥ* (Cairo) I, 83, 13–14; Ibn Burhān al-ʿUkbarī, *Šarḥ* II, 364, –1–365, 2; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 151, 14–16; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 428, 9–12; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufašṣal*, 109, –1–110, 1; 154, 8–10; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 98, 1–4; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 167, 1–4.

⁹² See, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 53, 2–3.

⁹³ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 7, 6–10; al-Zajjājī, *Maʿānī* (1994) I, 201, 17–202, 2; al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 53–54; 55–59; al-Fārisī, *Taʿlīq* II, 225, 10–12; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 140, 10–11 (part of *masʿala* 147); al-Rummānī, *Maʿānī*, 56, 10; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 331, 11–332, 3; al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾij*, 106, 11; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 182, 1–6; al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 225, 1–5; 225, 10–12.

⁹⁴ See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 125, 1–3. Cf. al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 226, 3–5; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1660, 14.

⁹⁵ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 62, 9–10.

⁹⁶ See al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 694, 1; al-Baṭalyawṣī, *ʿIṣlāḥ*, 50, –1–51, 3; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 23, 15; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1660, 5 last lines.

⁹⁷ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʿInṣāf*, 238–241 (*masʿala* 79). For a concise description of the discussion and the arguments presented by the two sides, see al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb* II, 38, –1–40, 6; al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 80, –3–82, 2.

is. The Baṣrans reject the Kūfans' view and contend that *li-* is *ḥarf jarr*, i.e. an 'āmil which syntactically affects nouns. The *naṣb* in the verb following *li-* is thus not due to its direct effect but rather to an 'an *muḍmara*. Since according to the Baṣrans *kay* is used by some speakers as *ḥarf jarr* (see chapter 3, §6), they reject the comparison that the Kūfans make between the particles *li-* and *kay*, which justifies, according to the Kūfans, regarding *li-* as the 'āmil of the following verb.

9. CAN 'AN APPEAR AFTER *LI-*?

9.1. *Sībawayhi*

After explaining that *naṣb* following *li-* is due to 'an *muḍmara* (see §8.1), Sībawayhi discusses the possibility of an overt 'an following this particle. He distinguishes between two different cases: *li-* as in *jī'tuka liṭaf'ala* (later referred to as *lām kay*) and *li-* in sentences such as *mā kāna liyaf'ala* (later referred to as *lām al-juḥūd*).

In the first case, Sībawayhi says, as in *jī'tuka liṭaf'ala* 'I came to you in order that you do [something]', overt 'an following *li-* can either appear or not. He says that these two possibilities are similar to the situation with *kāna*, that may or may not appear following the particle 'in in the sentences 'in *xayran faxayrun* 'if it (i.e. the matter) is good, it (i.e. the recompensation) will be good' and 'in *šarran fašarrun* 'if it (i.e. the matter) is bad, it (i.e. the recompensation) will be bad'.⁹⁸

On the other hand, overt 'an cannot appear after *li-* in the structure of *mā kāna liyaf'ala*. According to Sībawayhi the impossibility of 'an in this structure is similar to the impossibility of a verb in examples such as 'iyyāka waZaydan 'beware of Zayd!'. Sībawayhi adds that 'an in such examples thus occurs only in the *taqdīr* structure (see §8.1).⁹⁹

9.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' does not refer to this issue in his *Ma'ānī*.

⁹⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 362, 16–19. Cf. Ibn al-Anbārī, *Inṣāf*, 239, 18–20. See also Wright, *Grammar II*, 100, –5–2 (beginning of §41, Rem. b.).

⁹⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 362, 19–25.

9.3. Other grammarians

Most grammarians agree with Sibawayhi. Some refer in their explanation only to *lām kay* (following which 'an can appear),¹⁰⁰ others only to *lām al-juḥūd* (following which it cannot appear)¹⁰¹ and most to both kinds.¹⁰² Some later grammarians, like Ibn Mālik and Ibn Hišām, put *lām al-juḥūd* in opposition to the other kinds of *li-* followed by a verb in *naṣb*: only following *lām al-juḥūd* can there be no 'an, whereas following all other three kinds of *li-* followed by a verb in *naṣb* it is optional.¹⁰³ The grammarians who claim that 'an cannot appear after *lām al-juḥūd* either present Sibawayhi's explanation or use other theoretical arguments.¹⁰⁴

The question of whether 'an following *lām al-juḥūd* is possible is also discussed in Ibn al-Anbārī's *ʾInṣāf* as a dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans.¹⁰⁵ The Baṣrans reject the possibility while the Kūfans allow it.

9.3.1. The presence of 'an when the utterance following *li-* is negated (*li'allā*)

As mentioned in the previous section, many grammarians are of the opinion that the appearance of 'an after *lām kay* is optional, but some add that when the utterance introduced by *lām kay* is negated by *lā*, 'an is compulsory, thus giving rise to the word *li'allā*.¹⁰⁶ Some grammarians argue that 'an in this context is necessary because without it a preposition (*li-*)

¹⁰⁰ See, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* (1996) II, 150, 11–12; al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1052, 12–13.

¹⁰¹ See, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Ma'ānī* (1994) I, 201, 19–202, 2.

¹⁰² See al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 55, 1–7; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 53, 5–11; al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 152, 4–5; 152, 8–10; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 9–11; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 262, 7–9; 262, 15–16; Ibn Mālik, *ʾAlfiyya*, 161, 4–5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 119, 15–120, 2; Ibn Abī Rabīʿ, *Šarḥ* I, 232, 7–9; 233, 7–8; Ibn Abī Rabīʿ, *Kāfi* II, 235, 2 last lines; 236, 3; Ibn Hišām, *ʾAwdaḥ* II, 79, 1–2; 86, 4–7; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 294, 17–295, 1; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 197, 16–20; al-Suyūṭī, *ʾAlfiyya*, 38, 10–11.

¹⁰³ See Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl*, 233, 5–7; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 49, 8–14; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Šarḥ*, 478, 23–479, 2; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963), 66, 2–8; 67, 1–3; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šudūr*, 268, 6–10; Ibn Hišām, *Jāmi'*, 172, 4–7; al-Azharī, *Taṣriḥ* II, 388, 6–8.

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 57, 4–59, 5; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 144, 7–12 (*mas'ala* 151); al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 693, 11–to end (cf. al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 439, 7–10 and Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 936, 5–8, where the authors repeat al-Šantamarī's explanation word for word, without explicitly mentioning his name); Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 206, 1–9; al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 46, –3–2.

¹⁰⁵ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʾInṣāf*, 246, 5–17 (*mas'ala* 82).

¹⁰⁶ See al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1052, 12–13; al-Zamaxšārī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 110, 10–11; Ibn Mu'tī, *Fuṣūl*, 203, 2 last lines; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 262, 7–9; Ibn Mālik, *ʾAlfiyya*, 161, 4–5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 119, 13–14; 119, –1–120, 2; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 49, 15–16; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ 'umda*, 343, 5–9; Ibn al-Nāzim, *Šarḥ*, 478, 21–22; Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 294, 15–17; al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* III, 197, 16–18; al-Suyūṭī, *ʾAlfiyya*, 38, 10.

would directly join a negative particle (*lā*), a sequence (**lilā*) that is impermissible, and even had it been permissible, it would have caused a *tiqal* ‘difficulty’.¹⁰⁷ This argument is, however, invalid since, as al-Astarābādī correctly says, other prepositions can be adjoined to the negative particle *lā* without any apparent *tiqal*. Al-Astarābādī exemplifies this with the compound *bilā* ‘without’ in which the preposition *bi-* is attached to the negative particle *lā*.¹⁰⁸

10. CONCLUSION

Early grammarians do not discuss the particle *li-* followed by a verb in *naṣb* at great length. The two kinds of *li-* which are usually discussed with respect to a following *maṣṣūb* verb are *lām kay* and *lām al-juḥūd*, whereas the other two kinds, *lām al-‘āqiba/al-ṣayrūra* and *li-* in the structure *‘urīdu li(‘an) taf‘ala*, seem to draw less attention. With one exception only (Ibn Šuqayr), all grammarians agree that the following verb takes *naṣb*. On theoretical issues related to this particle, however, there are various opinions and also reported disputes among Baṣrans and Kūfans. Among these issues are the following: which negative particles can be used in conjunction with *lām al-juḥūd*?; how should the structure of *lām al-‘āqiba/al-ṣayrūra* be explained?; and is *li-* the *‘āmil* which induces the following verb to take *naṣb* or rather *‘an muḍmara* following it?. As for the pronunciation of this particle preceding a *maṣṣūb* verb, there is some evidence for speakers who pronounced it *la-* and not *li-*.

¹⁰⁷ See Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 206, 11–15; Ibn Ya‘īš, *Šarḥ* II, 935, 20–23; Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I, 131, 6–7; 131, 12–13; II, 140, 11; 140, 14; Ibn Abī Rabī‘, *Šarḥ* I, 233, 7–9; Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910) I, 163, 11–12; al-Makkūdi, *Šarḥ* II, 692, 1–5; al-Azharī, *Taṣriḥ* II, 387, –2–388, 2; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham’* IV, 141, 3–7.

¹⁰⁸ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 80, 11–13, where the author criticizes his teacher, Ibn al-Ḥājib, who expresses the opinion that the speakers do not attach *ḥarf jarr* and *ḥarf nafi*.

CHAPTER TEN

FREE NAŞB

1. INTRODUCTION

The title of this chapter deserves a word of explanation. The term “free *naşb*” refers to the (rather rare) instances in which an expected *naşb*-inducing particle is missing. When the mood of the associated verb is *manşūb*, this is usually explained as due to the syntactic influence of an *ʿan muḍmara*, *ʿan* concealed in the speaker’s mind. In the instances of *naşb* discussed in the previous chapters, on the other hand, the literal utterance consists of either a particle (*ʿan*, *lan*, *kay* or *ʿidan*) which directly induces the following verb to take *naşb* or another particle (such as the conjunction *fa-* or the preposition *li-*), after which *ʿan muḍmara* is posited in the *taqdīr* structure (but *ʿan* itself does not occur in the literal utterance).

1.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi discusses “free *naşb*” in two places in his *Kitāb*, where he refers to examples of this structure and explains the mood of the relevant imperfect verb in each. From several examples in the later of the two discussions, it can be inferred that Sībawayhi argues that when the imperfect verb occurs without the expected preceding *ʿan*, the verb should be in the *rafʿ* mood. In the earlier discussion Sībawayhi quotes a line of poetry and justifies the *naşb* mood of a verb not preceded by *ʿan* as due to poetic license.

1.2. *Al-Farrāʾ*

In his *Maʿānī al-Farrāʾ* provides several examples from the Qurʾān and poetry in which an imperfect verb occurs without the expected preceding particle *ʿan*. According to al-Farrāʾ the verb in these examples is *marfūʿ*.

1.3. *Other grammarians*

Later grammarians discuss both the examples Sībawayhi refers to in his *Kitāb* as well as others from the language of the Bedouins. Most of them agree that where an expected *ʿan* is omitted the relevant imperfect

verb should be in *rafʿ*. The *naṣb* mood in such a case is conceived by some as possible but exceptional.

2. GRAMMARIANS' OPINIONS ON THE MOOD OF VERBS MISSING A PRECEDING 'AN

2.1. *Sībawayhi*

Sībawayhi mentions the rare occurrence of an imperfect verb without the expected preceding 'an in two places in his *Kitāb*. In the first Sībawayhi argues that the mood of the relevant verb is *naṣb* due to poetic license, and in the second he explains that the verb should take *rafʿ* because the literal utterance lacks the 'an which would have caused it to be *manṣūb*.

The first discussion takes place in chapter 59, devoted to *al-mafʿūl ma'ahu*.¹ Towards the end of the chapter Sībawayhi discusses utterances from which a part is omitted, and cites a line of poetry in which a verb takes the *naṣb* mood although no *naṣb*-inducing particle precedes it. The verse is *falam 'ara miṭlahā xubāsata wāḥidin / wanahnahtu naṣṣi ba'da mā kidtu 'af'alah* 'I did not think that anyone like her is the booty of one person [but rather of a great army], and I prevented myself [from taking her] after I had almost done it'.² Sībawayhi explains that the *naṣb* mood of the verb *'af'alah* at the end of the verse is due to the influence of 'an which is omitted from the literal utterance. He concludes that this omission and the *naṣb* mood are due to poetic license.³

Chapter 253 is the second place in which Sībawayhi mentions examples in which an imperfect verb occurs without the expected preceding *naṣb*-inducing particle.⁴ The chapter deals with sentences whose first part consists of an imperative verb, a prohibition, a question, etc., and the second part is a *jawāb* in *jazm*.⁵ At the end of the chapter Sībawayhi

¹ This term is explained in chapter 7, note 72.

² A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by 'Āmir b. Juwayn al-Ṭā'ī (or an unknown person of the tribe of Ṭay'; see Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*, 218a, 18). According to Abū Muḥammad al-Sirāfi, the meaning of *xubāsa* is *ḡanīma* 'booty'. See al-Sirāfi, *'Abyāt* I, 339, 1–4. Cf. Jahn, *Translation* I.2, 198, note 45 of chapter 59, last line. Al-Šantamarī, on the other hand, argues that the word *xubāsa* here means *zulāma* 'exaction', in which the poet was interested but then changed his mind. See al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 155. For the meaning of the whole verse and the context in which it was said, see al-Sirāfi, *'Abyāt* I, 337–340 (verse 163); al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 401; al-Baḡdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 472–474.

³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 129, 5–7.

⁴ For the whole discussion, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 401, 9–19.

⁵ These sentence types are thoroughly discussed with respect to the corresponding types in which the *jawāb* is introduced by *fa-* followed by *naṣb*. See chapter 6, §5.

discusses the examples *murhu yaḥfirhā* 'order him, and then he will dig it (i.e. the grave)'⁶ and *qul lahu yaqul dāka* 'tell him, and then he will tell that'. In addition, he quotes a Qur'ānic verse with the same structure: *qul li'ibādīya lladīna 'āmanū yuqīmū l-ṣalāta wayunfiqū mimmā razaqnāhum* 'tell my servants who believe [that] they [should] perform the prayer and expend of that which we have given them!' (Qur'ān 14:31). The structure of these three examples is *jawāb al-'amr*.⁷ In reference to the first example Sībawayhi presents an argument that can be also applied to the other two: *law qulta murhu yaḥfiruhā 'alā l-ibtidā'i kāna jayyidan* 'had you said *murhu yaḥfiruhā* (i.e. with the verb in *raf'*), due to the explanation of *ibtidā'* 'beginning of a new utterance',⁸ it would have been appropriate'. He then adds that the *raf'* mood of *yaḥfiruhā* in *murhu yaḥfiruhā* can be also explained '*alā ṣay'in huwa qalīlun fī l-kalāmi* 'according to a phenomenon (literally: something) which is rare in speech': the intended utterance was *murhu 'an yaḥfirahā* (viz. with the verb in *naşb*), but since '*an* does not occur, the verb is *marfū'*.⁹ Sībawayhi compares the last example to sentences introduced by '*asā* 'perhaps': as one can say both '*asā Zaydun qā'ilan* and '*asā Zaydun yaqūlu* with the same meaning ('perhaps Zayd will say'), the complement of '*asā* being *manşūb* and *marfū'*, respectively, so is it possible to say both *murhu 'an yaḥfirahā* and *murhu yaḥfiruhā* with the same meaning, the complement of *murhu* being *manşūb* and *marfū'*, respectively. However, Sībawayhi emphasizes that examples of verbs that take the *raf'* mood due to the omission of a preceding '*an* are rare. He concludes the discussion with a famous line of poetry and a Qur'ānic verse which demonstrate this exceptional construction. The line of poetry is '*alā 'ayyuhā l-zājirī 'aḥḍuru l-waḡā / wa'an 'aṣhada l-laddātī hal 'anta muxlidī* 'O you who prevent me from attending the battle and participating in pleasures, will you make me eternal [if and when I comply to you]?'.¹⁰ The Qur'ānic verse is *qul 'afaḡayra llāhi ta'murūnnī 'a'budu*

⁶ This translation is based on several modern sources. See Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 190, -9; Wright, *Grammar* II, 26, §15, beginning of note b.; Howell, *Grammar* II, 54a, 13 (part of §418).

⁷ Ibn Xarūf, one of Sībawayhi's commentators, explicitly says that the *jazm* mood in the first of the above-mentioned three examples is due to *jawāb al-'amr* and that the meaning of this sentence is *murhu bil-ḥafri yaḥfir* 'order him to dig, and then he will dig [it]', the prepositional phrase *bil-ḥafri* being omitted from the literal utterance. See Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*, 183, -5--4. Cf. Rabin, *West-Arabian*, 186 (beginning of §II).

⁸ That is, *yaḥfiruhā* introduces a new utterance which is syntactically unconnected to the preceding one. Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 190, -5.

⁹ Cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 162, 4 last lines.

¹⁰ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by Ṭarafa b. al-'Abd al-Bakrī. For details on the Qaṣida in which this verse appears and on its meaning, see al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 402; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ sawāhid* (1966) II, 800-806 (verse 609).

'ayyuhā l-jāhilūna 'say: is it other but God you bid me to worship, you ignorant [people]?' (Qur'ān 39:64). Sibawayhi explains the *raf'* mood of the verbs 'aḥḍuru and 'a'budu in these two examples as due to the fact that they are not preceded by 'an in the literal utterance. It may be noted that other versions of the above-mentioned line of poetry exist, with the same meaning but a different syntactic structure. The first is 'alā 'ayyuhā l-lāhiya 'an 'aḥḍura l-waḡā.¹¹ Here 'an occurs in the literal utterance and the following verb is *manšūb*, and so is irrelevant to the discussion above. In another version of the verse the verb is 'aḥḍura (in *naṣb*), and no preceding 'an; it is thus identical with Sibawayhi's version, except that the verb is *manšūb* and not *marfū*.¹² According to this version, the verse can serve as evidence for *naṣb* occurring despite the omission of the expected preceding particle 'an.

2.2. Al-Farrā'

According to al-Farrā' when an imperfect verb occurs without a preceding 'an, it takes *raf'*. His position is similar to Sibawayhi's second explanation of the *raf'* mood in such examples (see §2.1 above). Al-Farrā' refers to this issue in several places in his *Ma'ānī* and the relevant examples are provided in §2.2.1 below. He also discusses a theory proposed by some grammarians, according to which 'an can be omitted in some structures (see §2.2.2 below).

2.2.1. Al-Farrā's examples of his view that a verb is *marfū* if the preceding 'an is omitted

- a. Qur'ān 39:64 which Sibawayhi cites and discusses in the same context.¹³
- b. *Wa'id 'axaḍnā mūtāqa banī 'Isrā'ila lā ta'budūna 'illā llāha* 'and when we made a covenant with the children of Israel [saying that] you shall not worship any other but God' (Qur'ān 2:83).¹⁴

¹¹ See al-Sirāfi, *'Abyāt* II, 49, -1-50, 2. See also al-Šā'ir, *Šawāhid*, 78-79, §d, where Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī's *al-Qaṣā'id al-sab' al-jāhiliyyāt* is quoted as having this version of the verse based on al-Tawzī (d. 233 AH; see *ibid.*, 79, 2 last lines).

¹² Nöldeke comments on this version of the verb in *naṣb* that it was only created to support a grammatical theory. See Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 105, note 1. Reckendorf, on the other hand, cites this version as acceptable and comments that it represents an exceptional but valid construction. See Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 61, 5-9 (part of §34).

¹³ For his brief mention of this verse, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 53, 8-9.

¹⁴ For his discussion of this verse, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 53, 8ff. Al-Farrā's words are explained in Dīrah, *Naḥw*, 388-389. Cf. al-Zajjāj, *'Irāb* II, 630, 3-4.

- c. *Walā tamnun tastakṭiru* 'do not pardon [thinking that] you profit!' (Qur'ān 74:6).¹⁵

Al-Farrā' also cites the line of poetry used by Sībawayhi, that begins with the words *'alā 'ayyuhā l-zājirī 'aḥḍuru l-waġā* (for the full reference and translation, see §2.1 above). From al-Farrā's short reference to this example it cannot be inferred whether in his view the relevant verb in this verse is *marfū'* or *manṣūb*.¹⁶ However, in view of his explicit opinion on the three Qur'ānic verses quoted above, it is quite likely that in his view the relevant verb in the above-mentioned line of poetry is *marfū'*.¹⁷

2.2.2. *The theory proposed by some grammarians that 'an can be omitted when the agents of the main and the dependent verbs are the same*

The discussion's starting point is a *qirā'a* of the main verb of the Qur'ānic verse *walā taḥsabanna llaḏīna kafarū sabaqū 'innahum lā ya'jizūna* 'do not think that the unbelievers have outstripped [God]! They will not evade' (Qur'ān 8:59).¹⁸ Al-Farrā' states that there are those who read the main verb in this verse in the third person, i.e. *yaḥsabanna* instead of *taḥsabanna*. This would result in a permissible sentence, he argues, if *'an* preceded the verb *sabaqū*, so that the sentence were *walā yaḥsabanna llaḏīna kafarū 'an sabaqū*. He subsequently discusses the possibility of omitting *'an* in similar contexts. For the sake of the discussion he presents the following theoretical question: why must *'an* be pronounced following a verb denoting thought (such as *yaḥsabanna* in the previous example) and why is it not possible to say **'aẓunnu 'aqūmu* 'I think [that] I will stand' and **'aẓunnu qumtu* 'I think [that] I stood'? He explains that this is a valid question since there are contexts in which *'an* can be omitted from the literal utterance, as in the example *'urīdu 'aqūmu ma'aka* 'I want [that] I stand with you'. Judging from these contexts one would think that

¹⁵ For his discussion of this verse, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* III, 201, 4–6. Cf. al-Naḥḥās, *Trāb* V, 66, 1–3.

¹⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* III, 265, 4–12.

¹⁷ In the printed edition of al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī* the verb is *manṣūb* (see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* III, 265, 10), but it is unclear whether this form actually appears in the manuscripts on which this edition is based or is a mere decision of the editor. However, it can be inferred from the reference of al-Naḥḥās to al-Farrā's view on this (see al-Naḥḥās, *Trāb* V, 232, 1–7) that the latter considered the verb to be *marfū'*. Cf. Dirah, *Naḥw*, 389–390, where the author explains al-Farrā's view, emphasizing that nowhere does he say that the relevant verb is *manṣūb*.

¹⁸ For his discussion of this verse, see al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 414, 16ff. and especially 415, 5–416, 2.

following a verb denoting thought, too, the verb could occur directly, without a preceding *'an*. But al-Farrā' answers that some (grammarians) argue that *'an* can be omitted before a verb only if the agent of this verb is identical to that of the preceding, main verb, as in the above-mentioned sentences *'azunnu 'aqūmu* and *'azunnu qumtu*, in contrast to the impermissible **'azunnu yaqūmu* 'I think [that] he will stand' and **'aradtu yaqūmu Zaydun* 'I wanted [that] Zayd would stand'. According to al-Farrā' the logic behind this view is that only when the agent of the two verbs is the same, can the second be replaced by a participle: the sentence *'urīdu 'aqūmu* 'I want [that] I stand' is permissible, because it can be replaced by *'urīdu qā'iman*, whereas the sentence **'urīdu yaqūmu Zaydun* is impermissible, because it cannot be replaced by **'urīdu qā'iman Zaydun*.

It should be noted that al-Farrā' does not explicitly refer to the mood of the relevant verb, preceding which *'an* should have occurred. The orthography does not distinguish between *raf'* and *naṣb* in these examples. However, the explicit view he expresses in his commentaries on the Qur'ānic verses quoted in §2.2.1, makes it likely that in these examples, too, he would maintain that the relevant verb takes *raf'*.

2.3. Other grammarians

The common opinion among grammarians is that when *'an* is omitted before an imperfect verb, this verb is *marfū'*. Others maintain that *naṣb* is also possible in this context, even if *šādd* 'exceptional'. In what follows I present the views of some grammarians on this issue.

Al-Axfaš refers to a Qur'ānic verse with a *marfū'* verb and gives two possible explanations for the mood: (1) this verb begins a new sentence, syntactically unconnected to the previous one; (2) an expected preceding *'an* has been omitted from the literal utterance.¹⁹ Al-Axfaš quotes two additional examples of such a structure from the speech of the Bedouins and a line of poetry (which Sibawayhi and al-Farrā' cite, too, beginning with the words *'alā 'ayyuhā l-zājirī 'aḥḍuru l-waḡā*). In these examples, the *raf'* mood can be explained by the omission of *'an* before the relevant verbs. The two examples from the language of the Bedouins are *'ataytuka tu'īnī watuḥsinu 'ilayya watanzuru 'ilā ḥājati* 'I came to you [in order that]

¹⁹ The verse is *wahīẓan min kulli šayṭānin māridin lā yasma'ūna 'ilā l-mala'i l-'alā wayuqḍafūna min kulli jānibin* 'and to preserve against every rebel devil, [so that] they do not listen to the high council. They are pelted from every side' (Qur'an 37:7–8). The relevant *marfū'* verb is *yasma'ūna*. For the whole discussion, see al-Axfaš, *Ma'ānī* (1985) I, 308, –1–309, 10.

you give me [something], benefit me and examine my matter' and *murhu yu'tīnī* 'order him [that] he gives me [something]'. Al-Axfaṣ explains that *yu'tīnī* here is in the *raf'* mood because it begins a new sentence (as if the sentence were *murhu fahuwa yu'tīnī* 'order him and then he will give me [something]') or, alternatively, because 'an should have preceded it but is omitted.

Al-Zajjāj, too, argues that when an expected preceding 'an does not occur before an imperfect verb in the literal utterance, this verb takes *raf'*. In one of his books he devotes a comprehensive chapter to this issue,²⁰ where he quotes some Qur'ānic verses, the line of poetry which Sībawayhi, al-Farrā' and many grammarians cite in this context (... *aḥḍuru l-waġā*) and the famous proverb *asma'u bil-mu'aydiyyi xayrun min 'an tarāhu* '[that] you hear of the little man of Ma'add is better than you see him'.²¹ Some grammarians, however, quote the proverb with the verb *asma'a* in *naşb*, either with or without a preceding 'an.²² Yet other grammarians quote this proverb without referring to the mood of the relevant verb, and their view in this aspect thus remains unclear. An example of such a grammarian is Sībawayhi who cites this proverb in order to discuss the diminutive form *mu'aydiyy*.²³

Al-Mubarrad discusses the example *murhu yaḥfirhā/yaḥfiruhā*, which Sībawayhi cites, and argues, like Sībawayhi, that one explanation for the *raf'* form *yaḥfiruhā* is the absence of a preceding 'an, or in his words: *li'anna 'āmilahu lā yuḍmaru* 'because its 'āmil (i.e. 'an, the 'āmil of this

²⁰ See al-Zajjāj, *Ṭrāb* II, 630–633.

²¹ The word *mu'aydiyy* is the diminutive form of the adjective *ma'adīyy* which is derived from the proper noun Ma'add. Some sources state that Ma'add is a name of a tribe, so that the meaning of *mu'aydiyy* is 'the little man of the tribe of Ma'add'. For a discussion of the meaning of this proverb and the word *mu'aydiyy*, see al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* II, 1047, –2–1048, 2; al-Zamaxšarī, *Šarḥ* II, 621, 5–622, 5; al-'Ukbarī, *Mašūf*, 525, –2–526, –4. None of these sources make any reference to the mood of the verb introducing this proverb.

²² For a long discussion of these versions, see al-Baġdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 465–469 (example 195), where the author, based on one of the commentators of *Faṣīḥ Ṭa'lab*, mentions that al-Kisā'ī uttered this proverb and preceded it with 'an *asma'a*. He also attributes to al-Farrā' the statement that the Banū Asad say this proverb without 'an, Qays say it with 'an, while al-Farrā' himself argues that *al-fuṣaḥā* 'the eloquents' choose the former, i.e. without 'an (ibid., 467, 7–10).

²³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* II, 242, 14–17. Although Sībawayhi does not explicitly refer to the mood of the relevant verb, it is quite probable that he took it to be *raf'*, for two reasons: first, in light of his explicit opinion presented in chapter 253 on examples of a similar structure (see §2.1); and secondly, because in the printed editions of the *Kitāb*, the verb is vocalized in *raf'* while there is no trace of another version (in *naşb*) in the manuscripts on which these editions are based.

For additional grammarians who quote this proverb without referring to the mood of the verb that introduces it, see note 21 above.

verb which should have induced it to be *manṣūb*) cannot be concealed in the mind (i.e. omitted from the literal utterance and still have syntactic influence). Al-Mubarrad adds that some non-Başran grammarians (he probably means the Kūfans) allow putting the verb in *naṣb* without rejecting the possibility of *rafʿ*.²⁴

Taʿlab quotes two examples of this structure and says that the relevant verb in them can be either *marfūʿ* or *manṣūb*.²⁵ He characterizes the former as *qiyās*, i.e. the ordinary common way of speech, whereas the latter is *šadd* 'exceptional'.²⁶ The two examples are the above-mentioned line of poetry (... *aḥḍuru/aḥḍura l-waḡā*) and the proverb *xuḍi l-liṣṣa qabla yaʿxuḍuka/yaʿxuḍaka* 'seize the thief before he seizes you!'.²⁷

In his *Šarḥ al-ʿabyāt* al-Fārisī discusses in detail the omission of *ʿan* from the literal utterance.²⁸ The discussion's starting point is a line of poetry from which a verb is omitted, about which al-Fārisī's says: *waḥasuna l-ḥaḍfu liṭūli l-kalāmi* 'the omission is good due to the length of the utterance'. He then mentions several lines of poetry and the two proverbs mentioned above, from all of which *ʿan* is omitted due to the length of the utterance, in his opinion.²⁹ In some of them the relevant verb is *marfūʿ* and in others it is *manṣūb*. However, from an examination of al-Fārisī's discussion as a whole, it can be inferred that in his opinion the mood of the verb following the omission of *ʿan* should be *rafʿ*; the examples which he provides with verbs in *naṣb* are actually quotes from early grammarians, such as Quṭrub and Taʿlab, used in order to show that *ʿan* retains its influence even when omitted.³⁰

Ibn Jinnī, al-Fārisī's student, explicitly says that the omission of *ʿan* before a verb results in putting it in *rafʿ* and quotes some of the above-mentioned examples.³¹ In his discussion he makes an interesting statement concerning the frequency of omission: *ḥaḍfu ʿan qad kaṭura fī l-kalāmi*

²⁴ See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 84, 4ff.; 136, 5–11.

²⁵ For his discussion, see Taʿlab, *Majālis* I, 317, 7–10.

²⁶ For other grammarians who allow *naṣb* as an exceptional possibility, see al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 147, –2ff.; Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I, 132, 3–9; II, 143, 1–8; Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 270, 3ff.; Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Ḍarāʾir*, 152, 5–7; Ibn Mālik, *ʿAlfiyya*, 163, 6 (the Arabic text) and 162 (the editor's remarks); Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiyya* II, 134, –4–135, 2; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 50, 1–13; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 489, –3ff.; Abū Ḥayyān, *Taqrib*, 82, 3–4 (cf. his commentary in Abū Ḥayyān, *Tadrib*, 199); Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* V, 2420, 4 last lines; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 331, –1–332, –1; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ*, 299, 11–15; al-Makkūḍī, *Šarḥ* II, 704, 5 last lines.

²⁷ For his discussion, see al-Fārisī, *Šarḥ al-ʿabyāt* II, 402, –6ff. See also *ibid.*, 496, –1ff.

²⁸ Ibn al-Anbārī also mentions this argument in the context of the omission of *ʿan*. See Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* I, 101, 8–12.

²⁹ See especially al-Fārisī, *Šarḥ al-ʿabyāt* II, 403, –2–404, 2; 522, 4–6.

³⁰ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 285, 3–286, 1; 288, 9–289, 5.

hattā šāra kalā ḥaḍfin ‘omission of *ʿan* was so frequent in speech that it became as if it were not omitted (literally: similar to non-omission)’.³¹ He subsequently explains that the speakers were used to omitting *ʿan* from the literal utterance, but intending that it was still pronounced.

2.3.1. *The mood of the verb missing a preceding ʿan in dispute among Baṣrans and Kūfans*

Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a chapter in his *ʿInṣāf* to the mood of the verb when an expected preceding *ʿan* is omitted. He presents this issue as one of the topics on which the Baṣran and Kūfan schools disagreed, but an examination of the explicit opinions of Sībawayhi and al-Farrāʾ, the most prominent representatives of these schools, respectively, actually shows unanimity: both argue that the mood in such cases is *rafʿ* (Sībawayhi says that the *naṣb* mood in one example is due to poetic license); see §2.1 and §2.2 above. The following is a summary of the discussion as it is presented in the *ʿInṣāf*.³²

According to Ibn al-Anbārī the Kūfans contend that *ʿan* can induce the verb to take *naṣb* even when it is omitted from the literal utterance and there is no *badal* ‘replacement’ or compensation for this omission. The Baṣrans are said to hold the opposite view.

The Kūfans quote three examples as evidence for their opinion: one Qurʾānic verse and two lines of poetry. These three examples have already been mentioned and discussed above, but the Kūfans quote them with the relevant verb in *naṣb*. The first example is Qurʾān 2:83, with the *qirāʾa* of the relevant verb as *taʿbudū* instead of *taʿbudūna*: *waʿīd ʿaxaḍnā miṭāqa banī ʿIsrāʾīla lā taʿbudū ʾillā llāha* (this is the second example quoted and discussed in §2.2.1). Morphologically, the verb *taʿbudū* can be conceived as *majzūm* or *manṣūb*, and the Kūfans are said to posit the latter.³³ The two examples from poetry are the same two verses which Sībawayhi quotes; the Kūfans quote the verbs in *naṣb* (Sībawayhi quotes the first verse with the verb in *naṣb*, too, but explains the mood as poetic license; see §2.1). The Kūfans conclude that even according to the Baṣrans *ʿan* has a syntactic effect on the following verb when it does not occur in the literal utterance, viz. after the particles *fa-*, *wa-*, *li-*, *ʿaw* and *hattā* (here they refer

³¹ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 288, 16–17; 289, 3–4.

³² See Ibn al-Anbārī, *ʿInṣāf*, 232–235 (*masʿala* 77). Cf. Yaʿqūb, *Hurūf*, 161–162, where the author presents the main arguments in this discussion.

³³ It is interesting that al-Farrāʾ, too, mentions this *qirāʾa* of *taʿbudū*, but explicitly says that it should be understood as a prohibition, i.e. as a verb in *jazm*. See al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* I, 53, 8ff.

to the theory of the *'an muḍmara*), and this is also the case in the three examples just mentioned.

The Baṣrans respond to the Kūfans' arguments that *'an* is a weak *'āmil*; it belongs to a group of *'awāmil* affecting verbs which are weaker than those affecting nouns. Due to this weakness *'an* cannot have a syntactic effect unless it appears in the literal utterance or is omitted but has a *badal*. They further argue that since even the particle *'inna*, an *'āmil* affecting nouns, has no syntactic effect when it does not occur in the literal utterance, clearly *'an*, a weaker *'āmil* affecting verbs, does not have any such effect in the same circumstances.³⁴ A further proof for the weakness of *'an* as an *'āmil* is the fact that in the speech of some Bedouins, it does not have a syntactic effect even when it occurs in the literal utterance, due to the phenomenon known as *tašbīh 'an bimā* 'comparing *'an* to *mā* [and thus syntactically treating the former in the same way as the latter]' (for this claim, see chapter 1, §2.3.2.2-a). As for *'an* following the particles *fā-*, *wa-*, *li-*, *'aw* and *ḥattā*, the Baṣrans posit that it may have a syntactic effect even when it does not occur in the literal utterance, because each of these particles is a *badal* for it.

In another discussion in the *'Inṣāf*, on the *naṣb* mood following *li-*, another example which is relevant to the omission of *'an* is quoted on the authority of Hišām b. Mu'āwiya who cites his teacher al-Kisā'i to the effect that some speakers say *lā budda min yatba'ahā* 'there is no escape but [that] he follows her' (without the expected *'an* before the verb: *lā budda min 'an yatba'ahā*).³⁵ This example, attributed to one of the prominent founders of the Kūfan school, corresponds to the view attributed to the Kūfans and presented in the main discussion above.

2.4. Secondary sources

The common opinion among modern researchers is in line with the views of the grammarians: when *'an* is omitted before a verb, it takes *raf'*.³⁶ According to Wright examples in which the verb is *manṣūb* despite the omission of *'an* are rare.³⁷

³⁴ Cf. Ibn al-Anbārī, *Luma'* (1963), 83 (end of chapter 27).

³⁵ See Ibn al-Anbārī, *'Inṣāf*, 239, -3--2.

³⁶ See, for example, Fleischer, *Schriften* I.2, 757, -11--5; Wright, *Grammar* II, 27, note; Lane, *Lexicon* I, 104c; Vernier, *Grammaire* II, 486, §1033, end of note 8; Nöldeke, *Grammatik*, 105, 1-8 (beginning of §82).

³⁷ See Wright, *Grammar* II, 26, §15, first part of note b. Cf. Howell, *Grammar* II, 54a, 7ff. (part of §418); Ḥasan, *Naḥw* IV, 400-401; Muṣ'id, *Masā'il*, 105, -4-106, 5.

2.4.1. *Are examples in which 'an does not appear in the utterance a dialectal phenomenon?*

In his translation of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, Jahn explains Sībawayhi's opinion in this subject (see §2.1), but adds in a note to his translation³⁸ that the *raf'* mood in these examples are preferably to be conceived as a first beginning of the regular structure in the modern dialects, in which 'an is omitted following certain verbs. Jahn ends his note with a reference to Spitta's description of this construction in the dialect of Egypt.³⁹

Reckendorf quotes a few examples in which 'an does not follow verbs denoting desire, such as *šā'a* and *'arāda*, both meaning 'to want'. In a note he argues that the structure without 'an originates in Ḥijāz, but gives no references.⁴⁰ Rabin refers to this point in detail, quotes Reckendorf's opinion and elaborates on his arguments.⁴¹ Rabin notes that, according to the Classical Arabic dictionary *Tāj al-'arūs*, al-Liḥyānī, on the authority of al-Kisā'ī and al-Aṣma'ī, states that omission of 'an and putting the relevant verb in *raf'*, following verbs denoting desire, were *luġa fāšiya* 'a common dialectal structure' in Ḥijāz.⁴² Ibn Aṭīr is then quoted as saying that this structure, without 'an, is very common in the *kalām* 'speech'⁴³ of al-Šāfi'ī. Rabin thus arrives at the conclusion that the origin of the examples of this structure is in the West, even if there are some lines of poetry with this structure originating in the East. Rabin cites Sībawayhi, who does not

³⁸ See Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 105, note 15 of chapter 253.

³⁹ See Spitta, *Grammatik*, 350–352 (part of §165.b.2), where he discusses the structures of Classical Arabic in which 'an occurs before a dependent verb (for example, following verbs denoting desire, as in the structure *'amarahu 'an yaf'ala* 'he ordered him to do [something]'), and the corresponding structures in the spoken language in Egypt, in which 'an does not occur. Spitta emphasizes that already the grammarians mention a few verbs which connect directly, without 'an, to the following dependent verbs, such as some of the verbs which belong to the category of the *'af'al al-muqāraba* (for example, in the structure *kāda yaf'alu* 'he almost did [something]'). For a short explanation of the nature of this category of verbs, see chapter 1, note 4.

⁴⁰ See Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 383 (part of §188) and note 2 there, respectively. Cf. Fleisch, *Arabe*, 200, 8–13 and Fleisch, *Yaqtula*, 69–70, where the author quotes similar examples and refers to Reckendorf (mentioned above) and to Brockelmann, *Grundriss* II, §337.a for more examples.

⁴¹ For his discussion, see Rabin, *West-Arabian*, 185–186, §kk.

⁴² Without referring to Rabin, Fleisch (see Fleisch, *Arabe*, 200, 4–6; Fleisch, *Yaqtula*, 70) mentions the exact quotation from *Tāj al-'arūs* (al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1889) I, 626, 26): *yaqūlūna yuridu yaf'alu 'ay 'an yaf'ala* 'they (i.e. the speakers of Ḥijāz) say *yuridu yaf'alu* 'he wants to do [something]' (without 'an) that is [in the meaning *yuridu*] 'an yaf'ala (with 'an). Cf. Lane, *Lexicon* III, 119b–c.

⁴³ Rabin understands *kalām* here as 'works', whereas Fleisch argues that it means 'speech'. See Rabin, *West-Arabian*, 185, 7–6 and Fleisch, *Yaqtula*, 70, §d, last line. I tend to agree with Fleisch, since the common meaning of *kalām* is 'speech', which also fits the context of a dialectal usage.

refer to a specific dialect, but only argues that this structure was hardly used in speech (*'alā šay'in huwa qalilun fi l-kalāmi*;⁴⁴ see §2.1, second part). Since Sībawayhi was in contact mainly with Bedouins from the eastern tribes, argues Rabin, this remark is very significant and shows that the structure without *'an* originates in the West and that it is more ancient: in the West this structure continued to be frequent in speech, whereas in the East it was only used as an archaic structure in poetry.⁴⁵

3. CONCLUSION

The structure discussed in this chapter, in which *'an* is omitted before an imperfect verb, is not common, according to Sībawayhi, but seems to be more common already a few centuries later (see Ibn Jinnī's words quoted at the end of §2.3 and the reference in note 31). According to the prevalent opinion among grammarians, the relevant verb in such examples takes *raf'*, since in the literal utterance there is no *'āmil* inducing it to take *našb* (i.e. *'an*). Nevertheless, several grammarians acknowledge the possibility of putting this verb in *našb*, but argue that it is exceptional. In §2.4.1 the evidence for dialectal differences in this context is discussed and analyzed. According to this evidence, the structure without *'an* (such as *yurīdu yaf'alu* instead of *yurīdu 'an yaf'ala*) originates in the West and represents a more ancient way of speech. Interestingly, this structure characterizes the modern dialects of Arabic today (see §2.4.1 and especially notes 39 and 45).

⁴⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 401, 11–12.

⁴⁵ According to Fleisch, *Arabe*, 200, 6–8, where the author follows Brockelmann, the structure without *'an* was common in Old Semitic and exists to this day in the modern dialects. Cf. note 39 above. See also Blau, *Grammar*, 211–215 (§§330–334).

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE POSSIBLE INTERCHANGEABILITY OF *RAF*ʿ AND *NAŞB*

1. INTRODUCTION

As has already been thoroughly explained in chapters 5–7, devoted to the conjunctions *ʾaw*, *fā*- and *wa*-, respectively, all grammarians, starting with Sībawayhi, discuss the different meanings of *manşūb* and *marfū*ʿ verbs following these conjunctions. However, some later grammarians, from approximately the time of al-Astarābādī (d. 684 or 686 AH) on, note that there are instances in which the mood, *naşb* or *raf*ʿ, does not affect the meaning of the following verb; in other words, these moods are interchangeable. In this chapter I shall present this view, held by the later grammarians al-Astarābādī, Ibn Mālik, Abū Ḥayyān and Ibn Hišām, and then discuss two interesting statements by the early grammarian al-Farrāʾ, which may indicate that he, too, holds this view.

The above-mentioned grammarians' claim that the *raf*ʿ and *naşb* moods are interchangeable is strongly linked to a distinction they make between two possible explanations for *raf*ʿ following a conjunction, in both of which the *marfū*ʿ verb is conceived as introducing a new sentence. For most grammarians there is only one explanation for the *raf*ʿ mood in such a situation: the sentence following the conjunction is syntactically unconnected to the previous one, and the verb which introduces it is thus considered the predicate of an omitted subject. Sībawayhi calls this *inqiṭāʿ* (or *ibtidāʿ*), al-Farrāʾ gives it the name *isti'nāf*, and other grammarians use the above-mentioned terms and also *qaṭʿ* (for a detailed discussion of this concept, see appendix A, §4). The later grammarians whose opinions are presented in this chapter, on the other hand, claim that there are actually two different possible explanations for the mood in this kind of sentence. According to the first, although this verb introduces a new sentence, that sentence is connected to the previous one in the manner of a protasis and an apodosis, i.e. just as the *manşūb* verb following a conjunction is connected to what precedes it. This explanation opens the way to making *raf*ʿ and *naşb* interchangeable in this context, since both moods have the same meaning. However, the new sentence introduced by the *marfū*ʿ verb may also be completely independent of the previous one, in which case

there is no syntactic connection between the two sentences, certainly not the above-mentioned connection between a protasis and an apodosis which characterizes the *naṣb* mood. Terminologically, some grammarians who hold this view, like Abū Ḥayyān, use the technical term *qaṭʿ* to denote the former possibility and *isti'nāf* for the latter. As explained above and in appendix A, §4, most grammarians use these two terms as synonyms for a lack of connection between the sentences following and preceding a conjunction which results in the *rafʿ* mood of the verb which introduces the second, new sentence.

Note that the theory of the interchangeability of *rafʿ* and *naṣb* discussed in this chapter is quite distinct from the theory of *ʾiṣrāk*, which can also account for the *rafʿ* mood in the verb following a conjunction. According to the latter theory, when the verbs preceding and following a conjunction both take *rafʿ*, the mood of the second can be explained as due to the fact that the same *ʾāmil* induces the mood of both verbs and they thus occupy the same syntactic position (for a detailed explanation and examples of *ʾiṣrāk*, see appendix A, §5). To clarify this point, I may say that according to Sībawayhi, al-Farrāʾ and most grammarians, the *rafʿ* mood of a verb following a conjunction can have two explanations: *ʾiṣrāk* or *inqiṭāʿ*, while according to the later grammarians whose views are introduced in this chapter, there are actually three possible explanations: *ʾiṣrāk* and two different ways in which the verb following the conjunction introduces a new sentence.

2. AL-ASTARĀBĀDĪ

In his discussion of sentences in which the verb following *fa-* is *manṣūb*, al-Astarābādī says that their *ʾaṣl* 'basic and primary structure' contains a *marfūʿ* and not a *manṣūb* verb, because the sentence introduced by this verb is *mustaʾnaf* 'new', or unconnected to the previous one. In his view there are instances in which the meaning of *sababiyya* (for this term, see appendix A, §12) which characterizes the *naṣb* mood is preserved although the verb following *fa-* takes *rafʿ*. Al-Astarābādī exemplifies this phenomenon with one Qurʾānic verse and two lines of poetry in which the associated verb following the conjunction is *marfūʿ*, although the meaning of the sentence is as if it were *manṣūb*. The Qurʾānic verse is the second of the following two (it is related to the preceding verse, which is therefore also quoted): *hāḍā yawmun lā yanṭiqūna walā yuʿdanu lahum fayaʿtadīrūna* 'This is a day they shall not speak neither be given leave, and excuse

themselves' (Qur'ān 77:35–36). The two lines of poetry are *'alam tas'ali l-rab'a l-qawā'a fayantiq / wahal tuxbiranka l-yawma baydā'u samlaqu* (this verse is already recorded by Sibawayhi; it is discussed and translated in chapter 6, §3.1.2.3-b) and *falaqad taraktu šabiyyatan marhūmatan / lam tadri mā jaza'un 'alayki fatajza'u* 'I left a dead girl, who does not know what a manifestation of grief on you is, and she manifests grief'.¹ Al-Astarābādī argues that in these three examples the structure remains the *'ašl* and the meaning of *raf*^c is like that of *našb*. In other words, had the verb following *fa-* in these three examples taken *našb* instead of *raf*^c, the meaning would not have changed.²

Al-Astarābādī subsequently generalizes this claim to the other two conjunctions *wa-* and *'aw*. He states that it is possible to put the verb following them in *raf*^c, even when the speaker wishes to convey the meaning of *našb*. He quotes the following Qur'ānic verse as an example of *'aw* followed by a verb that can take either *raf*^c or *našb*, with the same meaning: *satud'awna 'ilā qawmin 'ulī ba'sin šadīdin tuqātīlūnahum 'aw yuslimūna/ yuslimū* 'you shall be called against a people of great power to fight them or they will surrender/until they surrender' (Qur'ān 48:16). Al-Astarābādī says that this verse is further evidence that the *raf*^c mood has the meaning of *našb*.³

After he provides examples of the interchangeability of the *raf*^c and *našb* moods following the conjunctions, al-Astarābādī explains why it only rarely actually happens that *raf*^c is used when the meaning of *našb* is intended. He says that had the verb which conveys the typical *našb* meaning of *sababiyya* stayed in *raf*^c (according to the *'ašl*), the conjunction could erroneously have been understood as connecting the preceding and the following sentences. In order to make clear beyond doubt that this is not the case, the *našb* mood is used. Another advantage of using *našb*, he adds, is that it strengthens the meaning of *jazā'* which these sentences convey (for this term, see appendix A, §7).⁴ Al-Astarābādī's main idea is thus that even though the meaning of *našb* could have been conveyed by *raf*^c in this kind of sentence, the latter is usually not used in order to avoid confusion.

¹ A verse in the *kāmil* meter, by Muwaylik al-Mazmūm, who mourns the death of his wife.

² See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 66, 3–67, 2.

³ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 67, 3–8. For the views of Sibawayhi, al-Farrā' and other grammarians on this verse, see chapter 5, §2.1.1, §2.2 and §3.3.2, respectively.

⁴ See al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 67, 8–68, to end; 71, 16–19.

3. IBN MĀLIK

Ibn Mālik discusses the mood of the verb following the three conjunctions *'aw*, *fa*- and *wa*- in his *Šarḥ al-tashīl* and argues that *rafʿ* in such a case can be explained in three different ways:

- a. *ʾIšrāk*: the same *ʾāmil* induces the mood of the verbs preceding and following the conjunction, and they thus occupy the same syntactic position.
- b. *Bināʾ al-fiʿl ʾalā muḩtadaʾ maḩḩūf*: the verb is joined to an omitted subject of a nominal sentence, and this verb is taken as a part of a complete sentence.
- c. *Istiʾnāf*: the verb following the conjunction introduces a new sentence, unconnected to the previous one.

It should be noted that in explanations b–c above the conjunction is understood as introducing a new sentence. The difference between the two, according to Ibn Mālik, is that the *marfūʿ* verb in explanation b. has the same meaning as it would have if it had been in *naṣb*, whereas according to explanation c. the *rafʿ* mood conveys a different meaning than that of *naṣb*.

In his discussion Ibn Mālik first deals with *'aw*, then *fa*- and finally *wa*-. Although he treats *'aw* only briefly, his references to the other two conjunctions leave no room for doubt that he accepts all three possible ways of explaining *rafʿ* following the above-mentioned conjunctions. The following is a concise description of his view on *fa*-, which also corresponds to the other two conjunctions.⁵

Ibn Mālik states explicitly that there are two ways in which *fa*- can be taken as introducing a new sentence, whose verb as a result takes *rafʿ*. In the first the verb is *musabbab mabniyy ʾalā muḩtadaʾ maḩḩūf* '[conceived as] resulting [from the previous verb] and joined to an omitted subject of a nominal sentence', as in *mā taʾtīnī fatuḩḩadditunī*. Here the verb following *fa*- is *marfūʿ*, the *taqdīr* structure is *mā taʾtīnī faʾanta tuḩḩadditunī* 'you do not come to me, and [then] you converse with me', that is, the action denoted by the first verb is conceived as the reason for that of the second. The second way, on the other hand, is to conceive of the verb as *murattab*

⁵ For his discussion of *fa*- see Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 27, 9–12 (cf. Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 484, 4–8). For his view on *'aw* see *ibid.*, 25, 5–11; 26, 5; 26, 13–14. For his view on *wa*-, which is very similar to that of *fa*-, see *ibid.*, 35, 5 last lines; 36, 12–16; 37, 3–5; 37, 17–18.

lil-isti'nāf 'joined [to the previous verb] for [denoting the meaning of] a new sentence'. Ibn Mālik's explicit words leave no room for doubt that the *raf*^c mood explained by the first way conveys the same meaning as *našb*, whereas when it is explained by the second way, it has a different meaning than that of *našb*.⁶

4. ABŪ ḤAYYĀN

Abū Ḥayyān also distinguishes between two possible ways of explaining *raf*^c following a conjunction, both of which reflect an introduction of a new sentence. He calls them *qaṭ'* and *isti'nāf*.

In his discussion of the mood of the verb following *fa-*, he says that the *raf*^c mood of this verb in *i'tinī fa'ukrimuka* 'come to me and I will honor you' can be explained in two different ways. According to the first, which he calls *qaṭ'*, the meaning of this sentence is *i'tinī fa'anā 'ukrimuka*, which is equivalent to *'in ta'tinī fa'anā 'ukrimuka* 'if you come to me, I will honor you'. A different explanation, to which he refers as *isti'nāf*, results in the meaning *i'tinī fa'anā 'ukrimuka 'ataytanī 'aw lam ta'ti* 'come to me! And I will honor you, whether you come to me or not'.⁷ In other words, in the case of *qaṭ'*, what precedes *fa-* is connected to what follows it just like a protasis is connected to an apodosis, i.e. the *raf*^c and *našb* moods following *fa-* have the same meaning. In the case of *isti'nāf*, on the other hand, the utterances preceding and following *fa-* have no connection to each other, and thus *raf*^c has a different meaning than *našb*.

⁶ On the first way of explaining *raf*^c in *mā ta'tinī fatuḥadditunī* Ibn Mālik says the following: *fatarfa'u 'alā ja'li l-'ityāni sababan lil-ḥadīti wataqdīruhu fa'anta tuḥadditunī* 'you put [the verb *tuḥadditunī*] in *raf*^c due to conceiving of the action of coming [denoted by the verb preceding *fa-*] as connected to the action of conversing [denoted by the verb following *fa-*], and its meaning is [*mā ta'tinī*] *fa'anta tuḥadditunī* '[you do not come to me,] and [then] you converse with me'. Using the same words he characterizes *našb* in the similar example *mā ta'tinī fatuḥadditunī: fatanšibu 'alā ja'li l-'ityāni sababan lil-ḥadīti wataqdīruhu 'in ta'tinī tuḥadditunī* 'you put [the verb *tuḥadditunī*] in *našb* due to conceiving of the action of coming as connected to the action of conversing, and its meaning is *'in ta'tinī tuḥadditunī* 'if you come to me, you will converse with me'. See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣṣīl* II.2, 27, 10–11 and 27, 14–15, respectively. Ibn Mālik's above-quoted explanations of the *raf*^c and *našb* moods are identical, and it is thus clear that in his view both moods convey the same meaning.

For further examples see Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-taṣṣīl* II.2, 28, 8–10; 28, 16; 31, 1–6; 33, 6. For his conclusion and summary, where he repeats the three ways of explaining *raf*^c (introduced at the beginning of this section), see *ibid.*, 37, 19–38, 7.

⁷ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1670, 12–15. Cf. *ibid.*, 1670, 2–3.

5. IBN HIŠĀM

In his *Muġnī* Ibn Hišām expresses the same opinion as al-Astarābādī, Ibn Mālīk and Abū Ḥayyān, presented in §§2–4 above.⁸ The idea that the *rafʿ* mood following a conjunction can be explained in two different ways, named *qatʿ* and *istiʿnāf*, is exemplified by a Qurʾānic verse and a line of poetry mentioned and discussed in §2 above: Qurʾān 77:36 and the verse whose first hemistich is *ʾalam tasʿali l-rabʿa l-qawāʾa fayantiqū*. In addition, Ibn Hišām mentions another Qurʾānic verse in which the verb can take *rafʿ* but still has the meaning of *naṣb*: *lā yuqḍā ʾalayhim fayamūtūna* ‘it shall not be decreed them [to die], and [as a result] they will not die’ (Qurʾān 35:36).⁹ Exactly like al-Astarābādī, Ibn Hišām emphasizes in his concluding words that even if a *marfūʿ* verb can possess the same meaning as a *manṣūb* one, it will do so only rarely, and Qurʾānic examples should generally not be interpreted in that way—in Ibn Hišām’s words: *wallaḍī ʾaqūlu ʾinna majīʾa l-rafʿi biḥāḍā l-maʿnā qalilun jiddan falā yaḥsunu ḥamlu l-tanzīli ʾalayhi* ‘what I say is that the occurrence of *rafʿ* [following the conjunctions] in that meaning [of *naṣb*] is very rare and it is not fitting to interpret [examples of] the Qurʾān that way’.¹⁰

6. AL-FARRĀʾ

From al-Farrāʾ’s commentary on Qurʾān 77:36, discussed in §2 above, one can deduce that he, too, holds the view that the *naṣb* and *rafʿ* moods are interchangeable in some contexts. This is in keeping with the fact that this view has been attributed to the Kūfans (see §7 below), al-Farrāʾ being their most prominent representative. Here is a concise description of al-Farrāʾ’s commentary on this verse.¹¹

Al-Farrāʾ agrees with Sībawayhi that the verb *yaʿtaḍirūna* which ends the above-mentioned verse (*walā yuʿdanu lahum fayaʿtaḍirūna*) should be in the *rafʿ* mood. Both grammarians say that *fa-* here connects two

⁸ Interestingly, in his *Šarḥ šuḍūr* Ibn Hišām expresses a different opinion, common to Sībawayhi, al-Farrāʾ and most subsequent grammarians, according to which *rafʿ* can have only two explanations and not three (for this common opinion see §1). A possible reason for this inconsistency is the fact that his *Muġnī* is much more detailed than his *Šarḥ šuḍūr*. Another reason could be that this inconsistency reflects a development of Ibn Hišām’s opinion and perception of this issue.

⁹ See Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* (1910) II, 91, 17–92, 2.

¹⁰ See Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* (1910) II, 92, 1–2.

¹¹ For al-Farrāʾ’s discussion see al-Farrāʾ, *Maʾānī* III, 226, 4 last lines.

imperfect *marfū*^c verbs (*yu'danu* and *ya'taḍirūna*), so that the negation particle *lā* negates both, as if it read *walā yu'danu lahum falā ya'taḍirūna*.¹² Al-Farrā', however, adds the following with respect to the *raf*^c mood of *ya'taḍirūna*: *waxtira ḍālīka li'anna l-'āyāti bil-nūni falaw qīla faya'taḍirū lam yuwāfiqi l-'āyāti* 'this (i.e. the *raf*^c mood) was chosen, because the verses [end] with a *nūn* (i.e. this is the rhyme), and had it said *faya'taḍirū* (in *našb*), it would not have fit the [other] verses'. Here al-Farrā' refers to the rhyme of the adjacent verses; from verse 34 until verse 50 which ends the sūra, the last word of each verse ends with *-na*. The *našb* form *ya'taḍirū* (instead of *ya'taḍirūna*) would have broken the rhyme. It can be therefore inferred that were it not for the rhyme al-Farrā' would not object to the *manšūb* form *ya'taḍirū*.¹³ He then goes on to mention another verse with the same structure, which he quotes with the relevant verb in *našb* (Qur'ān 35:36, quoted and discussed in §5 above), and says *wakullun šawābun* 'and all (i.e. *raf*^c in the first verse and *našb* in the second) is correct'. He concludes the discussion with another verse in which the verb can take either *raf*^c or *našb*; this is Qur'ān 2:245 which is translated and explained according to al-Farrā's view in chapter 6, §3.2.2-a.

Another reference in al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī* may further support the claim that in his view *raf*^c is sometimes used instead of *našb* due to considerations of rhyme. In his commentary on another verse in which a verb following a conjunction is *marfū*^c (Qur'ān 3:111),¹⁴ he says that the associated verb which ends the verse is put in *raf*^c due to two reasons. First, because it introduces a new sentence (in his words: due to *isti'nāf*; for this term see appendix A, §4.2); and secondly, *li'anna ru'ūsa l-'āyāti bil-nūni faḍālīka mimma yaqwi l-raf'a* 'because the verses end¹⁵ with a *nūn*, and this strengthens the *raf*^c mood'. Al-Farrā' subsequently quotes two of the verses discussed above: Qur'ān 77:36 with the verb in *raf*^c and Qur'ān 35:36 with the verb in *našb*.

Al-Farrā' thus relates the *raf*^c mood to rhyme, and also presents instances of *marfū*^c and *manšūb* verbs which convey a similar or parallel meaning.

¹² For Sibawayhi's short reference see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 3–4.

¹³ See al-Anṣārī, *al-Farrā'*, 303, §(1), ب, where the author quotes al-Farrā' and emphasizes this point. Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 274, 2–3 and Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id* III, 95, 1–3, where the authors express their support for the *raf*^c mood of *ya'taḍirūna* due to the rhyme (the latter explicitly following al-Farrā').

¹⁴ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 229, 4 last lines.

¹⁵ Lane mentions that the word *ra's* (plural: *ru'ūs*) can mean 'the extremity of a thing; or, as some say, the end, or last, thereof'. See Lane, *Lexicon* III, 995c, 22–23. It is therefore quite likely that the meaning of *ru'ūs al-'āyāt* here is 'the endings of the verses'.

This can be taken as evidence for the view that for al-Farrā' *naṣb* and *rafʿ* may be interchanged with no change in meaning, an opinion which some later grammarians attribute to the Kūfans in general, as explained in the following section.

7. THE OPINION ATTRIBUTED TO THE KŪFANS, THAT *RAFʿ* AND *NAṢB*
FOLLOWING *FA-* MAY POSSESS THE SAME MEANING

Ibn ʿAqīl says that according to the Baṣrans the meaning of the *rafʿ* mood necessarily differs from that of *naṣb*, whereas the Kūfans maintain that these moods may convey the same meaning in a verb following *fa-*. According to Ibn ʿAqīl the Kūfans use two Qurʾānic verses as evidence that the *rafʿ* mood following *fa-* denotes the same meaning as *naṣb*. These are Qurʾān 77:36 and Qurʾān 35:36, discussed in §2 and §5, respectively. Ibn ʿAqīl then quotes al-Aʿlam (i.e. al-Šantamarī) who explains that the Baṣrans based their position on the fact that the *rafʿ* mood conveyed a different meaning than that of *naṣb* in most sentences (*raʿyan lil-ʾaḳtari*). Ibn ʿAqīl then says that Ibn ʿUṣfūr rejects al-Šantamarī's position that *rafʿ* and *naṣb* may have the same meaning.¹⁶ Unfortunately, I have been unable to find any mention of this issue in al-Šantamarī's and Ibn ʿUṣfūr's writings.

A similar reference can be found in Abū Ḥayyān's *Irtiṣāf*. With respect to al-Farrā's commentary on Qurʾān 77:36 (discussed in §6), Abū Ḥayyān mentions an opinion attributed to the Kūfans and in their wake to al-Šantamarī, that *rafʿ* and *naṣb* after *fa-* may have the same meaning. Abū Ḥayyān quotes a statement attributed to al-Farrā', which proves that this was indeed his opinion (I was unable to locate it in the latter's *Maʿānī*). This statement refers to a sentence which al-Farrā' reports as due to one of the Bedouins: *ʾafalā yaxruju ʾilā Makkata fayajuruḥu llāhu wayuṣību ḥājatahu fī l-mašyi* 'will he not leave for Mecca, and God will reward him, and he will obtain his matter in walking?'. According to al-Farrā', the verbs *yaʾjuruḥu* and *yūṣību*, which follow the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*, respectively, take *rafʿ* due to the preceding *marfūʿ* verb *yaxruju*, but the meaning is that of *naṣb*, due to *jawāb al-jaḥd wal-istifhām* 'the utterance [of a *maṣṣūb* verb] following negation and question'. Abū Ḥayyān then quotes al-Šantamarī just as Ibn ʿAqīl does (see above).¹⁷

¹⁶ See Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid* III, 94, 4–to end.

¹⁷ See Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1682, –3–1683, 6.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

1. INTRODUCTION

In this study I examined all the environments in which the *našb* mood occurs in Classical Arabic and adduced the opinions of the Arab grammarians on this mood. These environments include verbs following the four particles which, according to prevalent opinion, directly induce the following verb to take *našb*: 'an, lan, kay and 'īdan; the conjunctive particles 'aw, fa- and wa-; the prepositions hattā and li-; and also verbs which appear in the *našb* mood without the expected particle 'an.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the data gathered regarding the occurrences of the *našb* mood. These conclusions relate to:

- a. Differences between the methods of the early grammarians (especially Sībawayhi and al-Farrā') and those of the later grammarians
- b. Dialectal differences and historical developments concerning the *našb* mood
- c. The importance of the speaker's intention in the decision regarding the mood of the verb in general and the *našb* mood in particular

2. THE DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH BETWEEN EARLY (ESPECIALLY SĪBWAYHI AND AL-FARRĀ') AND LATER GRAMMARIANS

In the discussions of the *našb* mood a clear distinction can be seen between the early grammarians (especially Sībawayhi and al-Farrā') and most of their successors. Sībawayhi approaches the *našb* mood through a methodical analysis of examples from the spoken language of native speakers of Arabic, which is his most important source.¹ He also uses the texts of the Qur'ān and of ancient Arabic poetry.² Later grammarians quite often limit themselves to an attempt to elucidate Sībawayhi's views (without adding any new information) and to a technical analysis of the

¹ See Levin, *Spoken*, especially 204–217, §§1–2. See also Levin, *Dialectology*, 208–213, §§1–2.

² On Sībawayhi's attitude to the Qur'ān and ancient Arabic poetry, see Levin, *Qur'ān* and Levin, *Poetry*, respectively.

stock examples from the Qur'ān and ancient Arabic poetry. Sībawayhi also has a quite striking tendency to quote and explain examples which do not correspond to his theories. As Ba'albakī notes with respect to the *naṣb* mood following *fa*-, Sībawayhi's methodology and attitude differ completely from the often technical and superficial approaches of other grammarians (see Ba'albakī's view in chapter 6, §3.4 towards the end).

As for al-Farrā', his views regarding the *naṣb* mood often differ from those of Sībawayhi. A good example is his theory concerning *ḥattā* followed by an imperfect verb, which is totally different from Sībawayhi's theory (see chapter 8, §§3.1–3.2). Al-Farrā''s theories are usually not accepted by later grammarians, who prefer to adopt Sībawayhi's views.

Some grammarians after Sībawayhi do add new data and grammatical analysis to his *Kitāb*. Among these the following may be mentioned: Ibn Jinnī (10th century), al-Suhaylī (12th century) and Ibn al-Ḥājjib and his commentator al-Astarābādī (13th century). In addition, Abū Ḥayyān and al-Suyūṭī are noteworthy for supplying us with information based on early sources which are no longer accessible.³ Since these two grammarians are very reliable and their quotes of accessible sources are accurate, it can be assumed that so are their quotes of early sources which are not available to us in their original form.

3. DIALECTAL DIFFERENCES AND HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE NAṢB MOOD

For some cases of the *naṣb* mood there are early testimonies, some quoted by Sībawayhi himself, concerning dialectal differences among different speakers. In other words, it is known that some groups of speakers put the verb in *naṣb* following the associated particle, in accordance with the rules which Sībawayhi first formulated and subsequent grammarians usually adopted, but at the same time and in the same syntactic environments other speakers did not put the verb in *naṣb*.⁴ In addition, despite the rules concerning the *naṣb* mood which Sībawayhi adduces and the subsequent grammarians usually adopt, while trying to elucidate them, there are testimonies of exceptional instances in which the mood of the

³ See, for example, Abū Ḥayyān's quote of al-Jarmī's *Farx* with respect to *ḥattā* (chapter 8, §3.3.6) and al-Suyūṭī's quote of an interesting opinion with respect to *'idan* (chapter 4, §5.3.3-b).

⁴ See chapter 1, §2.3.2; chapter 2, §§3.3.2–3.3.3; chapter 4, §9; chapter 6, §6.3; chapter 8, §3.3.6.

verb is not as might be expected: sometimes a verb takes the *naṣb* mood unexpectedly (see, for example, the three lines of poetry which Sibawayhi quotes in chapter 6, §4.1) while in other cases it does not take the *naṣb* mood as expected according to the rules (see, for example, chapter 1, §§2.3.2.1–2.3.2.2; chapter 2, §3.3.2; chapter 11, the end of §7).

Generally speaking, it can be said that the rather complicated rules concerning the *naṣb* mood were not always implemented in the speech of some communities. More specifically, there are examples, which Sibawayhi records, where the verb takes a certain mood in contradiction to the rules. After some particles, such as *lan*, *kay* and *li-*, the verb almost always takes the *naṣb* mood (barring some exceptional instances), whereas for other particles, such as *'an*, *fa-* and *hattā*, there are complicated rules which attempt to define when the verbs following them take the *raf'* mood and when they take the *naṣb* mood.

It seems to me that a purely synchronic analysis of the *naṣb* mood is doomed to failure. While there are rules concerning the mood of the verb, there are exceptional examples and also exceptional communities of speakers who did not follow these rules. Therefore, a diachronic approach dealing with the historical developments of the status of these particles should also be undertaken.

Fleischer's analysis of the usages of *'an* and *'anna* in Classical Arabic, as well as Fischer's article from 1978 dedicated to the same subject (both presented in chapter 1, §2.4.1.1), can provide excellent starting points for a diachronic analysis of all particles which resemble *'an* syntactically, that is, the particles after which the verb, under certain conditions, takes the *naṣb* mood. Fleischer's and Fischer's discussions deal with *'an* and its probable historical developments; I believe that these discussions could be broadened to include all the cases of the *naṣb* mood. Historical changes and developments in the status of these particles are probably responsible for the complex situation in Classical Arabic concerning the *naṣb* mood. In pre-classical Arabic, Fischer says, *'an* did not have any syntactic effect on the following verb and was used merely to call attention to the following sentence. Only after some time, as the language evolved into what is known today as "Classical Arabic" did it begin to be perceived by speakers as a particle which syntactically affects the following verb, causing it to take the *naṣb* mood. It is quite likely that other particles underwent a similar development: *hattā*, for example, was initially used as an adverb implying 'finally, in the end', until it gradually began to be perceived as a particle which syntactically affects the following verb, causing it to take the *naṣb* mood (see chapter 8, §12.2). *Idan* experienced a similar evolution

(see chapter 4, §§9–10). It seems that the status of these particles, which lies between adverbs that do not affect the verbs following them syntactically and particles that do have such an effect, is responsible, at least partially, for some of the complexities in the rules concerning this mood and for some of the exceptional examples. It is also noteworthy that according to several later grammarians, from the time of al-Astarābādī on, there are instances in which the *naṣb* and *rafʿ* moods are interchangeable (see chapter 11). This view is evidence of the bewilderment felt by some (later) grammarians due to the “in between” status and the historical developments of the associated particles.

3.1. *Talmon's theory of 'the Old Iraqi School of Grammar'*

In Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*, the author formulates a theory which also applies to the *naṣb* mood of the imperfect verb in Classical Arabic. I wish to present its main ideas, their implications on the analysis of the historical developments concerning the *naṣb* mood and the faults which undermine it.

Talmon's hypothesis is that the grammatical theories found in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* should not be regarded as the earliest phase of the development of Arabic grammatical thought, but rather as linguistic innovations, led by al-Xalīl and Sibawayhi at the end of the second century AH, to an old grammatical tradition which he calls 'the Old Iraqi School'. According to Talmon, early grammatical writings up to the end of the second century AH contain traces of 'the Old Iraqi School' which was all-Iraqi but was mainly preserved in Kūfa. The next phase, according to Talmon's hypothesis, was the Baṣran innovative teaching of al-Xalīl and Sibawayhi, which became the mainstream of Arabic grammatical thought as against the Kūfan school. Many of 'the Old Iraqi School' principles were falsely associated only with the Kūfan school, al-Farrā' being its most prominent representative.

Talmon argues that al-Xalīl's and Sibawayhi's innovative theories put more emphasis on formal syntax, reflected in the *'amal* theory, whereas 'the Old Iraqi School' is based more on notional distinctions, such as that of *ṣarf*, used and explained by al-Farrā' (see appendix A, §13).⁵ The shift from 'the Old Iraqi School' theories to al-Xalīl's and Sibawayhi's innovations needed time to be fully absorbed and accepted; the theoretical

⁵ On this view, in the context of the *naṣb* mood, see Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*, 113–114; 209–211; 263; 271; 286–287; 297–299.

uncertainty about the *našb* mood and the exceptional instances in which the mood of the verb is not as might be expected (see the beginning of §3 above) may be accounted for by the fact that al-Xalil's and Sibawayhi's innovations were still not fully fixed.⁶

Talmon's theory is indeed an interesting attempt to confront the challenging issue of the grammatical ideas and concepts prior to Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*. It has, however, several faults which render it improbable: it is highly speculative and hypothetical, as Talmon himself admits;⁷ the scarcity of genuine early sources relevant to his study and their 'fragmentary character'⁸ undermine Talmon's claims for the existence of a distinct 'Old Iraqi School' and often lead to contradictions;⁹ the difference between Sibawayhi and his predecessors seems to be more gradual than abrupt and this refutes the book's theory of Sibawayhi's revolution.¹⁰

4. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPEAKER'S INTENTION IN THE DETERMINATION OF MOODS IN GENERAL AND THE *NAŠB* MOOD IN PARTICULAR

This important principle is present in many of the discussions of the *našb* mood. The mood of the verb is affected by the speaker's intention: if the speaker wishes to express an action perceived by him as a fact (whether it was realized in the past, is realized in the present or will be realized in the future), the verb following one of the above-mentioned particles takes the *rafʿ* mood. If the action which the verb signifies is not perceived by him as a fact but as a future action which might or might not be realized, the verb takes the *našb* mood.¹¹ This distinction resembles the usage of the subjunctive mood in languages of other families, such as the Romance

⁶ See Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*, 79–80, where the author hypothesizes that al-ʿAlāʾ b. Siyāba's exceptional view on one of the sentence types with *fa-* (see chapter 6, §3.2.4) may reflect early debates over the mood following *fa-*. See also *ibid.*, 270–271, §(vi).

⁷ See Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*, 64, referred to in Versteegh, *Review*, 531.

⁸ This is Talmon's formulation; see Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*, 163, 7.

⁹ See Baʿalbakī, *Review*, 414–415.

¹⁰ See Versteegh, *Review*, 533–534; Baʿalbakī, *Review*, 415, 5 last lines.

¹¹ For detailed discussions of the role of the speaker's intention in determining the mood in Arabic, see chapter 1, §3; chapter 6, §§3–4; chapter 7, §3; chapter 8, §12.1.

One of the most striking examples in this context is *ḥasibtuhu šatamanī faʿatiba/faʿatibu ʿalayhi* which is discussed in chapter 6, §3.1.5.3. According to Sibawayhi and other subsequent grammarians, the verb following *fa-* can take either *našb* or *rafʿ* according to the speaker's intention; the former is possible only if the speaker conceives of the action which the verb conveys as hypothetical, whereas the latter is necessary if this action occurred in reality.

languages, but comparison between Arabic and these languages is beyond the scope of this work.¹² It is not surprising that in cases where the particle conveys purpose, such as *kay*, *li-* and *hattā* in the sense of *kay* (one of its meanings with a following verb in the *naṣb* mood), grammarians are in almost unanimous agreement that the relevant verbs take the *naṣb* mood: the meaning of purpose is by definition related to an action which has not been realized; it is perceived as the purpose of another action denoted by the main verb, a purpose which has not yet been realized and achieved. It is also not surprising that some grammarians attached the *naṣb* mood to the future, whereas the *rafʿ* mood was attached to the present (see, for example, chapter 1, §2.3.1; chapter 8, §3.3.1.1, §4 and especially §4.3.1): the future reflects actions whose realization has not (yet) occurred, whereas the present (and certainly the past) reflect actions perceived as facts.

5. A NOTE ON EXCEPTIONAL EXAMPLES

As far as the exceptional examples mentioned in §3 above are concerned, in which the mood of the verb is not as expected according to the rules, one should observe that many of them are taken from ancient Arabic poetry, of which Sibawayhi already says that it contains structures, some corrupted, which are impossible in the regular spoken language.¹³ In other words, these examples should be treated with caution, due to the nature of this genre and its constraints of rhyme and metre. Nevertheless, some of these exceptional examples can probably be explained by the historical developments and dialectal differences described above.

See further Reckendorf, *Verhältnisse*, 730–731, §237, and especially *ibid.*, 730, 12–17: *Der Modus für eine solche Handlung ist der Subjunktiv, wenn sie ein Ziel bezeichnet, dessen Erreichung von irgend einem Zeitpunkt aus gesehen noch bevorsteht. Sobald dies nicht der Fall, und das Ziel erreicht ist oder als erreicht gedacht ist, macht sich auch die Vorstellung der Hinbewegung auf das Ziel nicht geltend* ‘the mood for such an action is the subjunctive, if it denotes a goal which is expected to be reached from a certain point of time. Once this is not so and the goal is achieved or is conceived as achieved, the idea of a movement towards the goal does not count anymore [and in this case the indicative mood is used—my addition]’. See also Aartun, *Subjunctive*, where the author states that the speaker’s decision whether to use the *naṣb* or *rafʿ* mood depends greatly on his perception of the associated action; in the former the action is taken as expected, hoped for or wanted, and in the latter as a fact. Cf. Holes, *Arabic*, 182–183, §6.2.2-b for a similar view with respect to Modern Arabic.

¹² For a comparison between the *naṣb* mood in Classical Arabic and the subjunctive mood in French, according to grammarians of these two languages, see Sadan, *Subjonctif*.

¹³ See Levin, *Poetry*, 279, §3.

APPENDIX A

BASIC TECHNICAL TERMS AND CONCEPTS

One of the greatest difficulties in reading the works of Classical Arabic grammarians is that the meanings of many of the technical terms and concepts they use are elusive, since they are often used without explicit explanation, and the reader is expected to be aware of the exact meaning. I have therefore deemed it appropriate to add an appendix to define and discuss the main technical terms and concepts which the grammarians use in expressing their views on the *naṣb* mood. As grammarians' opinions on this subject stand at the core of this book, the following explanations will focus on this aspect, and should thus not be taken as covering all possible meanings and notions of the terms in question in other grammatical and non-grammatical contexts.

The terms and concepts are sorted alphabetically. Their clarifications are based on Classical Arabic dictionaries and grammarians' statements. Throughout the book there are references to the relevant explanations in this appendix. This method seems to me preferable to repeating the main notions concerning a certain technical term or concept every time it is mentioned.

1. 'AMAL, 'ĀMIL

The concept of '*amal* 'grammatical effect' is one of the basic notions in Arabic grammar and underlies grammarians' theories and explanations of grammatical phenomena. Grammarians identify various '*awāmil* 'factors' (singular '*āmil*') that determine the '*ʿirāb*', i.e. the declension of the three case endings (*rafʿ*, *naṣb* and *jarr*) of the noun (*al-ism*) and the three mood endings (*rafʿ*, *naṣb* and *jazm*) of the imperfect verb (*al-fiʿl al-muḍāriʿ*; see §9).¹ The sound (*ḥarf*) which takes the case marker in the noun and the mood marker in the imperfect verb is called *ḥarf ʿirāb*.²

¹ See Levin, '*Amal*', 214–215, §1. On the refuted view that the nominal case endings are only determined by the syntactic function of the noun, see *ibid.*, 215–218, §2.

² See Levin, *Kalima*, 438, 2ff. On '*ʿirāb*' and *ḥarf ʿirāb*' see also *ET*² III, 1248b–1250a, s.v. '*ʿirāb*'.

The form *‘āmil* is the active participle of the verb *‘amilaḥ* ‘to affect’. As a technical term *‘āmil* denotes a factor that affects and determines the case endings of nouns and the mood endings of imperfect verbs. The *‘awāmil* are divided into two groups: *al-‘awāmil al-laḥẓiyya* ‘literal, or expressed *‘awāmil*’, and *al-‘awāmil al-ma‘nawīyya* ‘abstract, or unexpressed *‘awāmil*’. The former are pronounced by the speaker and occur explicitly in the literal utterance, whereas the latter are abstract and do not appear in the literal utterance.³ The *‘awāmil* which induce the moods of the imperfect verbs are mostly *laḥẓiyya*; the *naṣb* and *jazm* moods of the verb are taken as due to particles such as *‘an* and *lam*, respectively.⁴ The *‘āmil* which accounts for the *raf‘* mood, on the other hand, is an *‘āmil ma‘nawīyy*, namely the occurrence of a verb in the sentence in a position where a noun can appropriately appear.⁵

1.1. Al-‘Āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ

The literal meaning of this important theoretical principle is ‘the *‘āmil* has a uniqueness’. This uniqueness concerns the nature of elements it can syntactically affect; every *‘āmil* can either affect the case of a noun or the mood of an imperfect verb, but not both simultaneously. Therefore, a preposition, such as *ḥattā* and *li-*, can only be an *‘āmil* which syntactically affects nouns and not imperfect verbs. In addition, the conjunctions, such as *‘aw*, *fā-* and *wa-*, cannot have any syntactic effect, since they can be followed by both nouns and verbs. An imperfect *manṣūb* verb following the above-mentioned prepositions and conjunctions thus takes the *naṣb* mood, according to most grammarians, due to an *‘an muḍmara* (see §3.1).⁶

³ For a discussion and relevant examples see Levin, *‘Amal*, 218–221, §§3.1–3.2; Levin, *Musnad*, 159a, note 124.

⁴ When the *naṣb* and *jazm* moods cannot be accounted for by particles which explicitly occur in the sentence (*muḍhara*), most grammarians contend that they are concealed in the speaker’s mind (*muḍmara*). Cf. §3.

⁵ See Levin, *‘Amal*, 224–225, §3.2.2.

⁶ For Sibawayhi’s view on the case of *li-* and *ḥattā*, see Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 362, 1–8. Cf. al-Šantamarī’s commentary in al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 700, 8–11. For other explanations with respect to *li-*, see al-Zajjājī, *Lāmāt*, 53, 7–10; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 331, 11–332, 3; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Bayān* II, 377, 1–6; Ibn Ya’īš, *Šarḥ* II, 1088, 5–9. For similar explanations on the conjunctions in this context, see al-Warrāq, *‘Ilal*, 76, 4–7; 273, 1–274, 4; 277, 3–5; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 168, 2–3; Ibn al-Anbārī, *‘Inṣāf*, 229, 18–230, 1; 231, 5–8; Ibn Ya’īš, *Šarḥ* II, 929, 10–13. For a discussion of this theoretical principle, see also Levin, *‘Amal*, 227–228, §6; Ba’albakī, *Fā’*, 187, (1).

2. *ʿATF*

The meaning of this word in grammar is ‘adjunction’;⁷ as a grammatical term it denotes the connection of two elements. Connected by a conjunction, these two elements must be of the same kind, i.e. two nouns, two imperative verbs, etc., and connecting them by *ʿatf* means that there is an *ʾiṣrāk* ‘partnership’ between them:⁸ they are both affected syntactically by the same *ʿamil* and therefore occupy the same syntactic position in the sentence. On the other hand, an *ʿatf* between a noun and an imperfect verb, two disparate elements, requires putting the verb in *naṣb*. Grammarians in this context usually mention the conjunctions *ʾaw* ‘or’, *fa-* ‘and then, as a result’ and *wa-* ‘and’; later grammarians add *tumma* ‘subsequently’. In this kind of *ʿatf* the conjunctions preserve their regular meaning and do not possess the special meaning which characterizes other contexts in which they are followed by a *manṣūb* verb. For example, *ʾaw* which connects a noun and a *manṣūb* verb means ‘or’, whereas *ʾaw* which connects a non-*manṣūb* and a *manṣūb* verb means ‘unless’, according to Sibawayhi and most grammarians (see chapter 5, §2.1.1 and §2.1.2).⁹

It is noteworthy that both early and later grammarians, from the time of Ibn al-Sarrāj on, emphasize that an overt *ʾan* may follow such a conjunction, while this is impermissible in the case of a conjunction that has an added meaning, beside its regular meaning as a conjunction.¹⁰

2.1. *Sibawayhi*

Sibawayhi states that the conjunctions *ʾaw*, *fa-* and *wa-* can connect a noun and an imperfect verb. This verb is in *naṣb* and the conjunction preserves its semantic meaning. Sibawayhi explains that the mood is due to a desire to connect two elements of the same kind: the imperfect verb is *manṣūb* due to an *ʾan muḍmara* (see §3.1), so that the *taqdīr* structure (see §14)

⁷ See Lane, *Lexicon* V, 2080c.

⁸ For *ʾiṣrāk* see §5 below. Some grammarians use the two terms *ʾiṣrāk* and *ʿatf* interchangeably, and conceive of *ʿatf* as *ʾiṣrāk fi l-ʿamal*; see §5.3.1.

⁹ Another example is al-Mālaqī’s explicit division of *naṣb* following *wa-* into two groups: *al-muxālaḥa fi l-lafẓ* ‘difference in form’ and *al-muxālaḥa fi l-maʿnā* ‘difference in meaning’. The former denotes *wa-* that connects a noun and a verb (two unlike elements connected by *wa-* ‘and’), while the latter concerns *wa-* that possesses the additional meaning of *jamʿ* (see chapter 7, §4). See al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, 422, 13–424, 11.

¹⁰ For grammarians who refer to all three conjunctions *ʾaw*, *fa-* and *wa-*, see, for example, Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, *ʿAmālī* II, 600, 5–13 (*ʿimlāʾ* 80); al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 80, 5–7. See also the previous note and chapter 7, note 98 for specific references with respect to *wa-*.

actually contains a noun connected to an utterance that is equivalent to a noun ('*an* and the following *manṣūb* verb occupy the position of a verbal noun; see chapter 1, §2.1). As for *tumma*, Sibawayhi explicitly says that this conjunction, unlike *fā-* and *wa-*, cannot be followed by *naṣb* which is due to an '*an muḍmara*.¹¹

Below are three of Sibawayhi's examples of conjunctions which connect a noun and a *manṣūb* verb: a Qur'ānic verse and two lines of poetry. In the first two examples the conjunction is '*aw* and in the third it is *wa-*.¹²

- a. *Wamā kāna libašarin 'an yukallimahu llāhu 'illā waḥyan 'aw min warā'i ḥijābin 'aw yursila rasūlan fayūḥiya bi'idnihi mā yašā'u* 'it belongs not to any mortal that God should speak to him, except by revelation, or from behind a veil, or [that] he should send a messenger and reveal whatever he wishes' (Qur'ān 42:51). Sibawayhi says that according to al-Xalil the *naṣb* mood of the verb *yursila* following '*aw* is due to '*an*—not the one occurring in the verse, but an '*an muḍmara*. Al-Xalil explains that had the verb *yursila* been governed by the overt '*an*, the verse would have had no logical meaning (its meaning would have then been 'it belongs not to any mortal that God should speak to him [...], or [it belongs not to any mortal that] he should send a messenger'). According to al-Xalil, the utterance '*aw yursila* is connected to '*illā waḥyan*, as if it were said '*illā waḥyan 'aw 'an yursila*.¹³
- b. *Walawlā rijālun min Rizāmin 'a'izzatun / wa'ālu Subay'in 'aw 'asū'aka 'Alqamā* 'had it not been for honorable people of [the tribes of] Rizām and Subay', or [had it not been for that] I hurt you, 'Alqama, [I would have sworn that...]¹⁴'.¹⁵ Sibawayhi explains that the verb following '*aw* is *manṣūb* due to an '*an muḍmara*, since a verb (here: '*asū'aka*)

¹¹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 397, 19–21, where he does not mention the conjunction '*aw*, which in his view can also connect a noun and an imperfect verb (elsewhere in the *Kitāb* he explicitly refers to '*aw*; see a–b below).

¹² Examples of *fā-* which connects a noun and a *manṣūb* verb could not be found in the *Kitāb*, and similar examples with *tumma* are impossible according to Sibawayhi (see above). However, they are recorded by later grammarians (see §2.3).

¹³ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 381, 8–14. Cf. Jahn, *Translation* II.1, 162, 2 last lines.

¹⁴ As some grammarians explicitly say, *jawāb lawlā*, i.e. the utterance following *lawlā*, which introduces this verse, appears in the next verse, which is introduced by the word *la'aqṣamtu* 'I would have sworn'. See, for example, Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 274, 1–6, where the author says that the verse means *falawlā rijālun wa'ālu Subay'in 'aw musā'atī 'yyāka lakāna kaḍā* 'had it not been for people and [the tribe of] Subay' or my hurting you, so-and-so would have happened'. Cf. al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 723, 9; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 397–398 (verse 616) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 429.

¹⁵ A verse in the *ṭawīl* meter, by al-Ḥuṣayn b. al-Ḥumām al-Murri.

is connected to a noun (here: *rijālun*), as if the sentence were *lawlā dāka 'aw lawlā 'an 'asū'aka* 'had it not been for that thing or that I hurt you'.¹⁶

- c. *Lalubsu 'abā'atin wataqarra 'aynī / 'aḥabbu 'ilayya min lubsī l-šufūfī* 'wearing an *abaya* and being satisfied are preferable to me to wearing silk clothes'.¹⁷ According to Sībawayhi, since the verb *taqarru* cannot be connected to the noun *lubs* so that the two will function together as the subject of the predicate *'aḥabbu*, there is no choice but to posit an *'an muḍmara* which induces the verb following *wa-* to take *naṣb*.¹⁸

2.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' agrees with Sībawayhi's analysis of the syntactic structure of a conjunction connecting a noun and an imperfect verb: the verb is *manšūb* and the conjunction preserves its meaning.

One of his examples for *'aw* which connects a noun and a *manšūb* verb is Qur'ān 42:51, quoted in this context by Sībawayhi, too, and discussed in §2.1 above. A similar example of *fā-* is found in *al-Farrā'*'s commentary on the Qur'ānic verse *law 'anna lī karratan fa'akūna minā l-muḥsinīna* 'if I could only return again, that I would be among the righteous!' (Qur'ān 39:58). One of his explanations of the *naṣb* mood of the verb *'akūna* following *fā-* is that the sentence means *law 'anna lī 'an 'akurra fa'akūna*.¹⁹

I could find no examples in *al-Farrā'*'s *Ma'ānī* of *ṭumma* and *wa-* which connect a noun and an imperfect verb.

2.3. *Other grammarians*

Many grammarians discuss the use of conjunctions to connect a noun and an imperfect verb. Ibn al-Sarrāj, an early grammarian who treats this

¹⁶ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 381, 14–17. Cf. al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1994) IV, 403, 13–15; al-Naḥḥās, *Šarḥ*, 163, 3–4; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liq* II, 166, 1; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 152, 8–12 (part of *mas'ala* 163); Ibn Jinnī, *Muḥtasab I*, 326, –1–327, 1. See also the references in note 14 above.

¹⁷ A verse in the *wāfir* meter, by Maysūn bint Baḥdal. For the context of this verse and some explanations of the words, see, for example, al-'Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 397–398; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1904), 225; al-Baḡdādī, *Šarḥ II*, 457–458 (verse 192). See further Lane, *Lexicon* IV, 1569b, s.v. *šufūf*.

¹⁸ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb I*, 379, 22–380, 2. Cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab II*, 27, 2–4; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 150, 5–8; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr I*, 273, 6 last lines; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat I*, 718, –1–719, 7; al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 394–395 (verse 609) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 426; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ II*, 932, 11–18.

¹⁹ For the discussion of both verses see *al-Farrā'*, *Ma'ānī II*, 422, 8–12. The second explanation for the *naṣb* mood is that *fā-* introduces a *jawāb* to *law* (this sentence type is discussed in chapter 6, §3.2.5.1).

subject at length and explains it like Sibawayhi, uses the example *yuʿjibunī ɗarbu Zaydin wataɣɗaba* ‘Zayd’s hitting and [that] you are angry astonish me’ to explain this structure: the verb *taɣɗaba* is *manšūb* due to an *ʿan muɗmara* which occurs in the *taqdīr* structure, so that the noun *ɗarb* can be connected to the verb. The *taqdīr* structure is thus *yuʿjibunī ɗarbu Zaydin waʿan taɣɗaba*, which can also be formulated with two explicit nouns: *yuʿjibunī ɗarbu Zaydin waɣaɗabuka* ‘Zayd’s hitting and your anger astonish me’. Ibn al-Sarrāj emphasizes that *ʿan* here can also be explicitly pronounced.²⁰

Ibn Mālīk and later grammarians address this issue at length and provide examples for the use of the conjunctions *ʿaw*, *tumma*, *fa-* and *wa-* to connect a noun to an imperfect verb, which therefore takes the *našb* mood. They also emphasize that the *našb*-inducing *ʿan* can be explicitly pronounced, and some even argue that the occurrence of *ʿan* in the literal utterance is preferable and more common than its non-occurrence.²¹ Some of their examples are the same as Sibawayhi’s and al-Farrā’s (see §§2.1–2.2 above). Here are two other examples, with *tumma* and *fa-*, respectively (both from poetry):

- a. *ʾInnī waqatli Sulaykan tumma ʾaʿqilahu / kal-ṭawri yuɗrabu lammā ʾāfati l-baḡaru* ‘I, with respect to my killing Sulayk and subsequently [that] I pay the blood-price for him, am like a bull which is hit when the cattle goes around [a source of water]’.²² Ibn Mālīk and later grammarians explain that *tumma* here connects the noun *qatli* and the following imperfect verb, which is therefore *manšūb*.²³

²⁰ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 149, –2–150, 5. For a clear explanation of this structure with the conjunction *ʿaw*, see Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II, 156, 2–7.

²¹ See Ibn Mālīk, *Šarḥ ʿumda*, 343, –2–344, to end; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 488, 4–8.

²² A verse in the *basīṭ* meter, by Anas b. Mudrika l-Xaṭʿamī. For the context of this verse and some explanations of the words, see Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 283, –1–284, 2 (cf. Howell, *Grammar* II, 53, 5–14, where some of Ibn Hišām’s statements are explained); al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 399; al-Azharī, *Taṣriḥ* II, 390, 10–15. See also al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar*, 27 (verse 1038). For a thorough explanation with references to various sources on the meaning of the verse, see al-Baḡdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 459–465 (verse 194). See further Lane, *Lexicon* I, 364c–365a, where the author explains that the word *ṭawr* in this verse can be understood as ‘bull’ or ‘the green substance that overspreads stale water [...] or anything upon the surface of water which the pastor beats to make the water clean for the bulls or cows’.

²³ See Ibn Mālīk, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 134, 8–10; Ibn Mālīk, *Šarḥ al-taṣḥīl* II.2, 49, 3–4; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 489, 1–2; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1689, 2 last lines; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 330, 3 last lines; Ibn Hišām, *ʾAwḍaḥ* II, 87, 2 last lines; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 283, 5–284, 2; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ*, 298, 17–299, 1; Ibn ʿAqīl, *Musāʿid* III, 107, 3; al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 400, 3–5; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ al-ʿalfiyya*, 151, 7; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ* IV, 141, 2 last lines; al-Baḡdādī, *Šarḥ* II, 459, –4–3. Cf. Reckendorf, *Syntax*, 520–521 (beginning of §265c.α.).

- b. *Lawlā tawaqqu‘u mu‘tarrin fa‘urđiyahu / mā kuntu ‘ūtiru ‘itrāban ‘alā tarabi* ‘If it were not for the expectation of a beggar and [the fact that] I will please him, I would not prefer wealth over poverty’.²⁴ Here, too, Ibn Mālik and other later grammarians explain that *fa-* connects the noun *tawaqqu‘* and the following imperfect verb, which is therefore *manšūb*.²⁵

3. ‘İDMĀR

The literal meaning of this term is ‘concealing’, and in the grammatical context it means ‘suppressing a word which is to be understood implicitly’.²⁶ Grammarians often use this concept in elliptical sentences in which they cannot point to an ‘*āmil* of a certain word (for ‘*āmil* see §1). Their theoretical solution in such cases is that the ‘*āmil* is concealed in the speaker’s mind (*muđmar fī l-niyya* or *fī l-nafs*).²⁷ A *našb* mood due to an ‘*an muđmara* is one such case (see §3.1 below).

The opposite of ‘*idmār* is ‘*izhār* ‘revealing’. Ayoub emphasizes that these two are done by the speaker, whereas *tamṭīl* and *taqdīr* (see §14) are grammarians’ constructs created in order to account for the syntactic structure.²⁸

3.1. ‘An muđmara

According to the prevalent view among grammarians, the *našb* mood can be due to one of the four particles ‘*an*, *lan*, *kay* and ‘*idan*. Instances of the *našb* mood following prepositions (like *hattā* and *li-*) and conjunctions (like ‘*aw*, *fa-* and *wa-*) must be explained as due to an ‘*an muđmara*, since

²⁴ A verse in the *basīṭ* meter, by a member of the tribe of Ṭay’. For an explanation of the verse see, for example, al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar*, 26–27 (verse 1037).

²⁵ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 134, 6–7; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 48, –1–49, 2; Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, 488, 2 last lines; Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf* IV, 1689, 2–3; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 329, –1–330, 2; Ibn Hišām, ‘*Awḍaḥ* II, 87, 1–2; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ šuḍūr*, 283, 3–4; Ibn ‘Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, 299, 1–3; Ibn ‘Aqīl, *Musā‘id* III, 106, –1; al-‘Aynī, *Maqāṣid* IV, 398–399; al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ al-alfiyya*, 151, 6–7; al-Suyūṭī, *Ham’* IV, 141, 12–13.

²⁶ See Lane, *Lexicon* V, 1803b, where this meaning is also linked to ‘making use of a pronoun (*damīr*)’. Cf. *EP* III, 1027b, s.v. ‘*Idmār*, 2nd paragraph. For an extensive survey of ‘*idmār* in Arabic grammatical terminology, see *EALL* II, 300b, s.v. ‘*Idmār*.

²⁷ See Levin, *Two passages*, 107–108, §2; 109 (part of §3); *EP* III, 1027b, s.v. ‘*Idmār*, beginning of entry.

²⁸ See Ayoub, *Tamṭīl*, 3–4.

these prepositions and conjunctions cannot function as *‘awāmil* according to the principle called *al-‘āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ* (see §1.1).²⁹

Some later grammarians state that *‘an* is the strongest of the *‘awāmil* which induce the imperfect verb to take *naṣb*, and it therefore induces this mood both when it occurs in the literal utterance (*‘an muḏhara*) and when it is concealed in the speaker’s mind (*‘an muḏmara*). They attribute this view to al-Xalil.³⁰ Cf. chapter 4, §7.3.

4. *INQIṬĀ‘*

The literal meaning of this term is ‘cutting off, detachment’.³¹ In the grammatical context it means that the conjunction which connects two elements introduces a new sentence, syntactically unconnected to (cut off from) the one before. What precedes the conjunction is thus taken as unconnected to what follows with respect to the *‘āmil* which affects these two elements and their syntactic position. When a conjunction connects two imperfect verbs, *inqiṭā‘* means that the verb following this conjunction is the predicate of a new sentence, from which the subject (a personal or demonstrative pronoun) was omitted. This verb takes *raf‘*, since it is the predicate of a new sentence and is unaffected by any *‘āmil lafẓiyy* (see §1 above).

4.1. *Sībawayhi*

Inqiṭā‘ is one of the two explanations which Sībawayhi and most subsequent grammarians give for the possible *raf‘* mood of a verb following a conjunction (the other is *‘iṣrāk*; see §5 below). Below are two of Sībawayhi’s examples of *inqiṭā‘* with the conjunctions *tumma* and *fa-*, respectively, that connect two imperfect verbs. In these examples the verb preceding the conjunction is *manṣūb* due to the particle *‘an*, and

²⁹ In addition to the principle of *al-‘āmil lahu xtiṣāṣ*, some grammarians also put forth other arguments to show that these occurrences of *naṣb* are due to an *‘an muḏmara*. For discussions with respect to the *naṣb* mood following conjunctions, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 378, 6–9; al-Fārisī, *Ta’līq* II, 158, –2–159, 15; al-Fārisī, *Manṭūra*, 140, 12–141, 3 (part of *mas’ala* 147); al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1081, 9–1082, 4; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 168, 4–7; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 432, 6–8; Ibn al-Anbārī, *‘Inṣāf*, 230, 1–4; 231, 19–232, 2; Ibn Ya’īš, *Šarḥ* II, 929, 21–930, 5; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 27, 21–28, 1.

³⁰ See Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 107, 17–18; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-tashīl* II.2, 7, 10–13; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ qatr* (1963), 61, 8–10; al-Makkūdi, *Šarḥ* II, 687, 8–11; al-Azharī, *Šarḥ*, 203, –6ff.; al-Suyūṭī, *‘Aṣbāḥ* (1998) I, 554, 5–8; II, 268, 3–9. See also Reuschel, *al-Xalil*, 25, §1a.

³¹ See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2990a–b.

the following verb is *marfū*³² because it introduces a new sentence, unconnected to the previous one:³²

- a. *'Urīdu 'an ta'tiyānī tumma tuḥadditūnī* 'I want that you come to me, and afterwards you will converse with me'. Sībawayhi says that the meaning of this sentence is *'urīdu 'ityānaka tumma tuḥadditūnī* 'I want your coming [to me], and afterwards you will converse with me'. He adds that the *raf*³ mood in the verb following the other conjunctions (i.e. *wa-*, *fa-* and *'aw*) is also possible, according to the same explanation.
- b. *'Urīdu 'an ta'tiyānī fataštumunī* 'I want that you come to me, but (literally: and then) you curse me'. Sībawayhi notes that in this sentence the speaker does not wish to say that he wants you to curse, but rather *kullamā 'aradtu 'ityānaka šatamtanī* 'whenever I wanted your coming [to me], you cursed me'.

Another example of *inqitā*³ with *fa-* is *mā ta'tinī fatuḥadditūnī*, which can mean, according to Sībawayhi, *mā ta'tinī fa'anta tuḥadditūnī* 'you do not come to me, and you converse with me'. Here the verb following the conjunction *fa-* in the original (former) sentence occupies the position of the predicate of a nominal sentence in the *taqdīr* (latter) utterance, from which the subject (here: the personal pronoun *'anta*) was omitted.³³ Note that the original sentence can also be understood in an utterly different way, both syntactically and semantically, when the *raf*³ mood is explained as due to *'iṣrāk*; see §5.1 towards the end.

In chapter 242 of the *Kitāb*, devoted to *wa-*, Sībawayhi records two similar examples of *inqitā*³ with this conjunction:

³² See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 382, 15–17; 382, 20–21. These examples appear at the beginning of chapter 244 of the *Kitāb*, in which Sībawayhi treats *'iṣrāk* and *inqitā*³. The context of these examples is Sībawayhi's discussion of the *naṣb* mood following the conjunctions *fa-*, *wa-* and *'aw*, when they have a special meaning, not of a conjunction, and are thus followed by a *manṣūb* verb. Sībawayhi treats each of these conjunctions in the preceding chapters (241–243), and in chapter 244 they are discussed together in order to clarify the terms *'iṣrāk* and *inqitā*³, which are common to them all. *Tumma* is not discussed in a separate chapter because, according to Sībawayhi, it cannot have any meaning other than that of a conjunction, unlike the three above-mentioned conjunctions. In addition, according to Sībawayhi this conjunction cannot be followed by *naṣb* which is due to an *'an muḍmara* (see §2.1 and note 11 for a reference).

³³ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 374, 1–5. Cf. al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, ll. 15–16; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 710, 10–12; al-Fārisī, *Ta'līq* II, 150, 1–9.

- c. *Da'nī walā 'a'ūdu* 'leave me! And I will not return [whether you leave me or not]'. Sībawayhi explains that the *raf'* mood of the verb following *wa-* is due to *inqiṭā'* and that the sentence means *da'nī fa'innī mim-man lā ya'ūdu* 'leave me! And I am from those who do not return'. Sībawayhi implies that in the original sentence there is no syntactic connection between what precedes and what follows *wa-*, the latter is accordingly not *manṣūb* and the sentence thus does not have a meaning which is characteristic for *naṣb* following *wa-* (for this meaning see chapter 7, §4.1).³⁴
- d. *Zurnī wa'azūruka* 'visit me! And I will visit you [whether you visited me or not]'. Sībawayhi explains this sentence like the previous one.³⁵

4.1.1. *Ibtidā'* as a Synonym of *inqiṭā'*

Sībawayhi occasionally uses *ibtidā'* in the sense of *inqiṭā'*,³⁶ as do other grammarians, too (see §4.3.1 and note 45 for references).

4.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' uses the term *isti'nāf* 'inception'³⁷ for Sībawayhi's concept of *inqiṭā'*. Like Sībawayhi, *al-Farrā'* refers in this context to the various conjunctions. He also mentions *'itbā'*, a notion very similar to Sībawayhi's *'išrāk*. One of his examples for *isti'nāf*³⁸ is *'ātika 'an³⁹ ta'tīyanī wa'ukrimuka* 'I will come to you in order that you come to me, and I will honor you'. In this sentence the verb *'ukrimuka* is taken as introducing a new sentence.⁴⁰

³⁴ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 14–18. Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* (1910) II, 31, 10–15.

³⁵ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 379, 18–20. Cf. al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 111, 13–16 and the commentaries Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 942, 7–16; Ibn al-Ḥājib, *Šarḥ* II, 26, 11–27, 22. See also al-Azhārī, *Tahḍīb* XV, 675b, 3–7 (quoted in Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XV, 490a, 7–11, without explicitly mentioning al-Azhārī by name).

³⁶ See, for example, Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 380, 17–18; 381, 4. Note that the common meaning of *al-ibtidā'* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* is 'the *'amil* which makes the subject of the nominal sentence *marfū'*', this subject being called *al-mubtada'*. However, the original meaning of the verb *ibtada'a*, whose verbal noun is *ibtidā'*, is 'to put [something] at the beginning of a sentence', and this is the meaning of *ibtidā'* in this context. For a thorough discussion of the terms *al-mubtada'* and *al-ibtidā'* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, see Levin, *Mubtada'*, especially 80–81 (beginning of §4.1). See also Levin, *Amal*, 221–224, §3.2.1.

³⁷ See Lane, *Lexicon* I, 116a, where the author defines the possessive phrase *ḥarf isti'nāf* as follows: '*ḥarf isti'nāf*, in grammar, An inceptive particle, placed at the commencement of a new proposition grammatically independent of that which precedes it'.

³⁸ For occurrences of the verb *ista'nāfa* and the verbal noun *isti'nāf* in *al-Farrā'*'s *Ma'ānī*, see Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 29ff. Cf. Versteegh, *Grammar*, 135, 12–36.

³⁹ It seems that the particle *'an* here stands for *li'an*, from which the preposition *li-* was omitted. For the omission of prepositions before *'an*, see chapter 1, note 5.

⁴⁰ See *al-Farrā'*, *Ma'ānī* II, 68, 4–11.

Another example is *'innamā yakfihi 'an 'āmurahu fayaf'alu ba'da dālika mā yu'maru* 'it suffices for him that I command him, and he subsequently does what he has been commanded [to do]'.⁴¹

4.3. Other grammarians

Most grammarians treat *inqiṭā'* in the same way as Sibawayhi and al-Farrā'. Al-Mubarrad is one of the early grammarians who explain this term like Sibawayhi. One of his examples is *'urīdu 'an tukrima Zaydan fatuhīnuhu* 'I want that you honor Zayd, but (literally: and then) you despise him'.⁴² Ibn Jinnī exemplifies *inqiṭā'* with *'urīdu 'an 'azūraka fayamna'unī l-bawwābu* 'I want to visit you, but (literally: and then) the gatekeeper prevents me [from doing so]'.⁴³

4.3.1. *Qaṭ', isti'nāf and ibtidā' as synonyms of inqīṭā'*

Some grammarians use *qaṭ'* and *isti'nāf* instead of *inqiṭā'* (*isti'nāf* is used by al-Farrā', too; see §4.2).⁴⁴ Others, like Sibawayhi, use the term *ibtidā'*.⁴⁵

5. 'IṢRĀK

The literal meaning of this term is 'partnership'.⁴⁶ In the grammatical context *'iṣrāk* is an abbreviation of *'iṣrāk fī l-'āmil*, meaning a partnership between two elements linked by a conjunction, with respect to the

⁴¹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 100, 6–7.

⁴² See al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* II, 33, 3–9. For a similar short reference, although with a different example, see Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* (1996) II, 185, 13–16.

⁴³ See Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*, 78, 7–12. See further his commentators' explanations of this example in al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 602, –1–603, 10; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 516, 3ff.

⁴⁴ For the use of *qaṭ'* see, for example, al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 203, 9–10; 204, 1–2; al-Fārisī, *Ta'liqā* II, 169, 4–5.

For the use of *isti'nāf* see, for example, al-Zajjāj, *Ma'ānī* (1994) I, 199, 5–6; V, 123, 11–13; al-Sirāfī quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 88, note 20 of chapter 241; al-Warrāq, *ʿIlal*, 275, 4–6; Ibn Jinnī in his *Luma'* (for the reference see note 43 above); al-Harawī, *Azhiya*, 241, 7ff.; al-Kaffawī, *Kulliyāt*, 678a, 9–10.

For the interchangeable use of *qaṭ'* and *isti'nāf* see al-Rummānī, *Ma'ānī*, 44, 4–5; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 724, 7–13 (beginning of his commentary on chapter 244 of Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*); al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992), 391 (verse 599) and 399 (verse 619) = al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898) I, 422 and 430; al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999) VIII, 5289a, 10ff.; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Tawjīh*, 362, 12ff.; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 164, 12–165, 1; Ibn Ya'īs, *Šarḥ* II, 945–946; al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 70, 13–16; Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib*, 264, 13–14; Abū Ḥayyān, *Taqrīb*, 81, 15–16.

⁴⁵ See, for example, al-Naḥḥās, *Šarḥ*, 159, 5 last lines; 161, 1–3; al-Zamaxšarī, *Mufaṣṣal*, 112, 1–2; al-Murādi, *Janā*, 76, 6–10.

⁴⁶ See Lane, *Lexicon* IV, 1541c.

‘āmil which affects these two elements and the syntactic position which they both occupy. The conjunction is taken as causing the preceding and following elements to be affected by the same *‘āmil* and thus to occupy the same syntactic position. When a conjunction connects two imperfect verbs, *‘iṣrāk* means that the same *‘āmil* induces their mood and they thus share it, whether it is *rafʿ*, *naṣb* or *jazm*.

5.1. *Sībawayhi*

‘Iṣrāk is one of the two explanations which Sībawayhi and most subsequent grammarians give for the *rafʿ* mood of a verb following a conjunction (the other is *inqiṭāʿ*; see §4 above). But *‘iṣrāk*, unlike *inqiṭāʿ*, can also explain the *naṣb* mood of a verb following a conjunction, if the preceding verb is *manṣūb*, too. This is the case in the following four examples with conjunctions that connect two imperfect verbs:⁴⁷

- a. *‘Urīdu ‘an ta’tiyanī tūmma tuḥaddiṭanī* ‘I want that you come to me and afterwards [that] you converse with me’.
- b. *‘Urīdu ‘an tafʿala ḍāka watuḥṣina* ‘I want that you do it and [that] you do [it] well’.
- c. *‘Urīdu ‘an ta’tiyanā fatubāyi’anā* ‘I want that you come to us and then [that] you negotiate with us [on buying and selling]’.
- d. *‘Urīdu ‘an taṭṭiqa bijamīlin ‘aw taskuta* ‘I want that you speak nicely or [that] you be silent’.

Two of Sībawayhi’s examples of *‘iṣrāk* with *fa-*, in which the mood of the two verbs is *rafʿ*, are *lā ta’tīnī fatuḥaddiṭunī* and *mā ta’tīnī fatuḥaddiṭunī*, meaning *lā ta’tīnī falā tuḥaddiṭunī* and *mā ta’tīnī famā tuḥaddiṭunī*, respectively, ‘you do not come to me and do not converse with me’.⁴⁸ In these sentences the negative particle (*lā* and *mā*, respectively) is taken as negating both verbs, before and after the conjunction *fa-*. Note that the above-mentioned sentences can be analyzed quite differently, both syntactically and semantically, when the *rafʿ* mood is explained as due to *inqiṭāʿ*; see §4.1 towards the end.

⁴⁷ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 382, 13–15. For the context of these examples, which introduce chapter 244, see note 32 above.

⁴⁸ For a discussion of these two sentences, see Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 372, 17–18 and 374, 1–3, respectively. Cf. al-Sirāfi quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 86, note 1 of chapter 241, ll. 13–15; al-Šantamarī, *Nukat* I, 710, 9–10.

An example of *'iṣrāk* where the mood of the two verbs is *jazm* is *lā tamdudhā fataṣquqhā* 'do not stretch it and [do not] tear it!'.⁴⁹ In this sentence the negative particle *lā* negates the verbs both before and after the conjunction *fa-*.

5.2. *Al-Farrā'*

Al-Farrā' uses the term *'itbā'* 'making one thing follow the other'⁵⁰ instead of Sībawayhi's *'iṣrāk*. Like Sībawayhi, al-Farrā' refers in this context to the various conjunctions. He also uses the concept of *isti'nāf*, corresponding to Sībawayhi's *inqiṭā'*. One of his examples for *'itbā'*⁵¹ in which the verbs preceding and following the conjunction are in *naṣb*, is *'ātika 'an ta'tīyanī watuḥsina 'ilayya* 'I will come to you in order that you come to me and [that] you benefit me'. Al-Farrā' explicitly says that the verb *tuḥsina* following the conjunction *wa-* is *manṣūb* because it is connected to the preceding *manṣūb* verb *ta'tīyanī*, and they both occupy the same syntactic position.⁵³

5.3. *Other grammarians*

Most grammarians treat *'iṣrāk* in the same manner as Sībawayhi and al-Farrā'. Al-Mubarrad, one of the early grammarians who explain this term like Sībawayhi, gives the example *'urīdu 'an taqūma fataḍriba Zaydan* 'I want that you rise and [that] you hit Zayd'.⁵⁴

Al-Ḍarīr exemplifies *'iṣrāk* with *'urīdu 'an yadhaha fatukrima Zaydan* 'I want that he go and [that] you honor Zayd', in which the verb *tukrima* is *manṣūb* because it is connected to the preceding *manṣūb* verb *yadhaha*. Al-Ḍarīr explains that *'iṣrāk*, which results here in the *naṣb* mood of the verbs preceding and following *fa-*, is possible because *taṣiḥḥu l-'irādatu fihimā* 'the desire [denoted by the verb *'urīdu* preceding the particle *'an*] is correct for both of them'. However, he adds, *'iṣrāk* is not always possible, as shown by the ungrammaticality of **'urīdu 'an yaqūma fayaqūda* 'I want that he rise and [that] he sit'; this sentence is ungrammatical because it

⁴⁹ See Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 375, 16–17. For a discussion of this sentence, in which *naṣb* following *fa-* is also possible, see chapter 6, §3.1.3.

⁵⁰ See Lane, *Lexicon* I, 294b–c; 296a–b.

⁵¹ For occurrences of the verb *'atba'a* and the verbal noun *'itbā'* in al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī*, see Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 65–67.

⁵² See note 39 above.

⁵³ For the reference, see note 40 above. See further al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 33, 16–34, 15; 235, 2 last lines; 391, 11–13.

⁵⁴ For the reference, see note 42 above.

denotes the occurrence of the two actions of rising and of sitting at the same time.⁵⁵ This example should thus be vocalized *ʿurīdu ʿan yaqūma fayaqʿudu* ‘I want that he rise, but (literally: and then) he sits’, in which case the *rafʿ* mood of *yaqʿudu* is explained as due to *inqiṭāʿ*.⁵⁶

5.3.1. ‘*Atf* and *nasq* as synonyms of *ʿiṣrāk*

Some grammarians use the terms *ʿatf* or *nasq*, both literally meaning ‘conjunction’ or ‘connection’, instead of *ʿiṣrāk* (for *ʿatf* see §2).⁵⁷

6. *JAWĀB*

The term *jawāb* occurs in reference to the *naṣb* mood following *ʿidan*, *fa-*, and to some extent also *wa-*. As shown in an article devoted to this technical term,⁵⁸ grammarians use the term *jawāb* broadly to denote ‘an utterance that follows another utterance’⁵⁹ and in the more restricted sense of ‘an apodosis of a conditional sentence’. The apodosis naturally follows the protasis and is connected to it; the latter meaning is thus an instance of the former. The use of the term *jawāb* meaning ‘apodosis’ is actually an ellipsis of the second part of the technical term *jawāb al-ṣarṭ* (literally: the utterance following the condition).

7. *JAZĀʾ*

The term *jazāʾ* literally means ‘requital, compensation’.⁶⁰ In the grammatical context it denotes the utterance that follows the conditional sentence, i.e. the apodosis.⁶¹ The protasis and apodosis are called *al-ṣarṭ wal-jazāʾ*. However, as Carter and Levin note, by the time of Sibawayhi

⁵⁵ But cf. chapter 7, §3.2.2-a and note 40 there.

⁵⁶ See al-Ḍarīr, *Ṣarḥ*, 237, –6–3.

⁵⁷ For the use of *ʿatf*, see, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 179, 3–4; Ibn Mālik, *Ṣarḥ al-kāfiya* II, 123, –1–124, 2. See further Levin, *Distinction*, 122, note 24, where the author states that *ʿiṣrāk* and *ʿatf* have the same meaning and shows that Sibawayhi and al-Mubarrad call the conjunctions *ḥurūf al-ʿatf* and *ḥurūf al-ʿiṣrāk*. For the use of *nasq*, see, for example, Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996) II, 179, 5–6.

⁵⁸ See Sadan, *Jawāb*, especially §III.

⁵⁹ Cf. Baʿalbakī, *Fāʾ*, 200, 1–4.

⁶⁰ See Hava, *Dictionary*, 89, s.v. *jazāʾ*.

⁶¹ Al-Rummānī defines *jazāʾ* as follows: *al-jazāʾu l-mustaḥaqqu bil-ʿamali minā l-xayri wal-ṣarri wahuwa jawābu l-ṣarṭ* ‘the [technical term] *jazāʾ* [signifies] what merits good or bad deeds and it is the apodosis of a conditional sentence’. See al-Rummānī, *Risālatāni*, 73. Cf. Tahānawī, *Kaššāf* I, 268, 9–12; Lane, *Lexicon* II, 480b–c; Kinberg, *al-Farrāʾ*, 117ff.

and al-Mubarrad the technical term *jazā'* may already have come to denote not only the apodosis but a full conditional clause, i.e. a protasis and an apodosis.⁶²

7.1. Mukāfa'a as a synonym of jazā'

Some grammarians use the term *mukāfa'a* as a synonym of *jazā'*.⁶³

8. JAZM

Jazm literally means 'cutting off'.⁶⁴ As a technical term in Arabic grammar it denotes the elision of the *ḥarf'irāb*, which is replaced with a *sukūn* ('zero' vowel).⁶⁵ the mark of the jussive mood of imperfect verbs. According to the grammarians the jussive verbs take this mood due to various 'awāmil, all of them *lafẓiyya*.⁶⁶

9. MUḌĀRI' (AL-FI'L AL-MUḌĀRI')

The term *al-fi'l al-muḍāri'* (pl. *al-'af'āl al-muḍāri'a*) denotes the category known as imperfect verbs.⁶⁷ In Arabic these verbs are introduced by one of the four prefixes 'tny, e.g. *yaf'alu* 'he does/will do'. The Arabic term *al-fi'l al-muḍāri'* is an abbreviation of *al-fi'l al-muḍāri' lism al-fā'il* (pl. *al-'af'āl al-muḍāri'a li'asmā' al-fā'ilīna*) 'the verb which resembles the noun [in the form] of active participle'.⁶⁸ According to Sibawayhi, this term has its origin in the resemblance in the syntactic environments of imperfect verbs and active participles. For example, the particle *la-* (*lām al-ta'kīd* 'the emphasizing *la-*') can join elements of both categories, as in 'inna *Zaydan laqā'imun* and 'inna *Zaydan layaqūmu* 'Zayd is standing'.⁶⁹ In addition, the forms of the imperfect verb and the active participle are

⁶² See *EP* IX, 360a, s.v. *SHarf*, §2; Levin, *Musnad*, 148, note 21.

⁶³ For a definition of this term see al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī, *Ta'rifāt*, 292. Cf. al-Xalīl, 'Ayn VI, 164, where the author uses the verb *kāfa'a* in order to explain the meaning of the verb *jazā'* and the noun *jazā'*; al-Bustānī, *Muḥīṭ* I, 15a, 11–12.

⁶⁴ See Lane, *Lexicon* II, 421b, 2–4.

⁶⁵ See Lane, *Lexicon* II, 421b, 9ff.

⁶⁶ For further details see *EP* VII, 285b, s.v. *Muḍāri'*, part (c).

⁶⁷ Its counterpart is *al-fi'l al-māḍi'*; see *EP* V, 954b–955a, s.v. *Māḍi'*; *EALL* III, 96a, s.v. *Māḍi' and Muḍāri'*.

⁶⁸ See, for example, Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 2, 4–5, where the term first occurs in its complete version, while the abbreviated form is used later.

⁶⁹ See Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 2, 10–18.

similar: the pattern of the former (*yafʿal*) is identical to that of the latter (*fāʿil*); a closed syllable is considered equivalent to a long vowel (*yaf* and *fā*, respectively).⁷⁰

Imperfect verbs in Arabic are characterized by mood endings which, according to Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*, existed in the speech of the Bedouins.⁷¹ The *rafʿ*, *naṣb* and *jazm* moods, which are relevant to this work, are explained in the appropriate sections of this appendix.

10. NAṢB

Naṣb literally means 'setting up'.⁷² As a technical term in Arabic grammar it denotes the vowel *a* of the *ḥarf ʿi'rāb*:⁷³ the mark of the accusative case of nouns and of the subjunctive mood of imperfect verbs. According to the grammarians, accusative nouns and subjunctive verbs take this vowel due to various 'awāmil which are all *lafẓiyya*.⁷⁴ The *naṣb* mood in the grammatical thought is the main topic of this book.

11. RAFʿ

Rafʿ literally means 'elevation, raising'.⁷⁵ As a technical term in Arabic grammar it denotes the vowel *u* of the *ḥarf ʿi'rāb*:⁷⁶ the mark of the nominative case of nouns and of the indicative mood of imperfect verbs. According to the grammarians, nominative nouns and indicative verbs take this vowel due to various 'awāmil which are either *lafẓiyya* or *ma'nawīyya*.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ For further details see *EP*² VII, 285b–286a, s.v. *Muḍārīʿ*; Ibn El Farouk, *Subjonctif*, 122–123, §1.

⁷¹ For a reference to evidence in Sibawayhi's discussion of the 'imāla, see Levin, *Spoken*, 214, §2.4.2.2.

⁷² See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2799a.

⁷³ The term *naṣb* originates from the raised (*manṣūb*) position of the tongue in the middle of the palate in the articulation of the vowel *a*. See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2799b, 1–3; *EP*² VII, 974b, s.v. *Naṣb*, beginning of entry.

⁷⁴ See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2799a, –5–2799b, 9. For further details see *EP*² VII, 974b–975a, s.v. *Naṣb*.

⁷⁵ See Lane, *Lexicon* III, 1121b.

⁷⁶ The term *rafʿ* originates from the raised (*marfūʿ*) position of the tongue towards the top of the palate in the articulation of the vowel *u*. See *EP*² VII, 384a, s.v. *Rafʿ*, beginning of entry.

⁷⁷ See Lane, *Lexicon* III, 1122c, –5––2. For further details see *EP*² VII, 383b–384a, s.v. *Rafʿ*, §1.

12. *SABABIYYA*

This term is used mainly in reference to the *naṣb* mood following the conjunction *fa-*, but also in the context of *kay* and *hattā*. It is derived from the noun *sabab*, which means ‘reason’ but also ‘link, connection’.⁷⁸ In the context of the *manṣūb* verb, *sababiyya* can be thus defined as the connection between two actions, in which one of them is the cause of the other. In the context of *kay*, some grammarians say that this particle has the meaning of *sababiyya* and explain it as *al-dalālatu ‘alā ‘anna mā qablahā sababun limā ba’dahā* ‘pointing out that what precedes it (i.e. the action of the verb preceding *kay*) is a reason for what follows it (i.e. the action of the verb following *kay*)’.⁷⁹

13. *ṢARF*

The term *ṣarf* literally means ‘the turning [...] a thing away, or back, from its way, or course; [...] the shifting a thing from one state to another’.⁸⁰ In the grammatical context it usually means ‘morphology’,⁸¹ but there also exists another usage, which is relevant to this study; al-Farrā’ (and a few succeeding grammarians) explain the *naṣb* mood following *wa-* (and other conjunctions) as due to *ṣarf*. Al-Farrā’ defines this term in his commentary on Qur’ān 2:42, the first verse in which he explains the *naṣb* mood of a verb following *wa-*: *‘an ta’tiya bil-wāwī ma’tūfatan ‘alā kalāmin fī ‘awwalihi ḥādītātun lā tastaqīmu ‘i‘ādatuhā ‘alā mā ‘utīfa ‘alayhā fa’idā kāna kaḍālika fahuwa l-ṣarfū* ‘[*ṣarf* means] that you bring *wa-* connected to a [preceding] utterance, which is introduced by an element with a syntactic effect⁸² that is not appropriate to repeat (i.e. to apply) for the utterance to which it is connected [following *wa-*]. When this is so, this is *ṣarf*’.⁸³ Al-Farrā’ subsequently explains the *naṣb* case in the noun following

⁷⁸ See Lane, *Lexicon* IV, 1285b–c. Cf. Carter, *Sabab*, 56ff. and *EALL* IV, 100a, s.v. *Sabab*, where Carter translates the term *sabab* as ‘semantic link’.

⁷⁹ See Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, *Ṣarḥ* II, 933, 3–4. Cf. al-Jāmī, *Ṣarḥ* II, 243, –3–2.

⁸⁰ See Lane, *Lexicon* IV, 1680b, 12–17, s.v. *ṣarf*, beginning of entry.

⁸¹ For an extensive survey, see *EALL* IV, 118b, s.v. *Ṣarf*.

⁸² For this translation of *ḥādīt* (and *ḥādīṭa*, too) see Kinberg, *al-Farrā’*, 163–164.

⁸³ See al-Farrā’, *Ma‘ānī* I, 34, 1–2. See also al-Azhari, *Tahḍīb* XV, 674a, –1–674b, 9, where al-Farrā’ is quoted by name. Cf. al-Ṣāḡānī, *Takmila* VI, 547a, –2–547b, 7; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956) XV, 489b, 4–12; al-Fīrūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913) II, 413, 2 last lines.

*al-maf'ūl ma'ahu*⁸⁴ as due to *ṣarf*.⁸⁵ His second definition of *ṣarf*, found in his commentary on Qur'ān 3:142, proves that his perception of this term is general and applies not only to *wa-* but to other conjunctions as well: *wal-ṣarfū 'an yujtama'a l-fi'lāni bil-wāwi 'aw tumma 'awi l-fā'i 'aw 'aw wafti 'awwalihi jahdun 'awi stifhāmun tumma tarā dālika l-jahda 'awi l-istifhāma mumtani'an 'an yukarra fi l-atfi 'ṣarf* is when the two verbs are connected by [one of the conjunctions] *wa-*, *tumma*, *fa-* or *'aw*, in its beginning (i.e. of the utterance) there is negation or question, and you then see that it is impossible to repeat (i.e. to apply) that negation or question for the connected utterance (i.e. the negation or question particle cannot apply to the verb that follows the conjunction).⁸⁶

It is worthwhile mentioning that the technical term *ṣarf* which al-Farrā' uses so often was known among the Baṣrans. Already Ibn al-Sarrāj states that according to the Kūfans *ṣarf* induces the verb following the conjunctions to take *naṣb*.⁸⁷ Other Baṣran grammarians do not only mention this opinion but also criticize it, as described below.

Ibn Jinnī attributes the explanation of *ṣarf* to the Baghdadians (*qawl al-baḡdādiyyīna*) and says that it is partly correct and partly incorrect. It is correct in so far as it is indeed *yunṣarafu bil-fi'li l-tāni 'an ma'nā l-fi'li l-'awwali* 'diverted with the second verb (i.e. following the conjunction) from the meaning of the first verb (i.e. preceding the conjunction)'. On the other hand, it is incorrect to claim that this *ṣarf* is the *'āmil* which induces the verb following the conjunction to be *maṣṣūb*; *al-ma'ānī* (i.e. *al-'awāmil al-ma'nawīyya*; see §1) cannot induce verbs to take *naṣb* but only *raf'*,⁸⁸ just as they cannot induce nouns to take *naṣb* but only *raf'*.⁸⁹ Ibn Jinnī concludes with the comment that just as nouns take *naṣb* only due to *'awāmil lafẓiyya* (i.e. not *ma'nawīyya*), so do verbs.⁹⁰

⁸⁴ This term is explained in chapter 7, note 72.

⁸⁵ Cf. al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* II, 71, 6–11. Similarly, al-Farrā' explains *xilāf* as what induces the *naṣb* mood following the conjunctions and the *naṣb* case following *al-maf'ūl ma'ahu*; see §16.

⁸⁶ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 235, 16–17.

⁸⁷ See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* (1996) II, 189, 1–2. Cf. Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 207, 6–8; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Inṣāf*, 229, 5–18.

⁸⁸ In this case, the abstract *'āmil* which induces the imperfect verb to take the *raf'* when it occupies the position of a noun. Cf. the end of §1 and the reference in note 5.

⁸⁹ In this case, the abstract *'āmil* known as *al-ibtidā'*, which affects the subject of the nominal sentence to take the *raf'* case. Cf. note 36.

⁹⁰ See Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* I, 275, 7–276, 2. For a very similar opinion see al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* II, 1074, 16–1075, 11. Cf. al-Baṭalyawsi, *Islāḥ*, 247, 9–13; 248, 17–249, 8; Ibn al-Anbārī, *Inṣāf*, 230, 4–12; Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II, 934, 5–9.

The preceding paragraphs, §16 below, devoted to *xilāf*, and the relevant sections in the chapters dealing with the conjunctions 'aw, fa- and wa-,⁹¹ show that al-Farrā' in particular and the Kūfans in general contend that the *naṣb* mood following the conjunctions is due to *ṣarf/xilāf*, whereas the Baṣrans argue that it is induced by an '*an muḍmara*. Despite this difference, Carter argues in his article devoted to the terms *ṣarf* and *xilāf* (Carter, *Ṣarf*) that the former view should not be attributed to the Kūfans alone. In his opinion Sibawayhi and al-Farrā' very much agree on the nature of this term, and the main difference between them is terminological: Sibawayhi uses the term *xilāf* while al-Farrā' uses *ṣarf*. Carter argues that later Baṣran grammarians reject the use of *ṣarf* and give greater emphasis to Sibawayhi's formal explanation, that the *naṣb* mood is due to an '*an muḍmara*. The result of this development, he claims, is that the technical term *ṣarf* came to be attributed exclusively to the Kūfans. It seems to me that there is indeed some similarity between Sibawayhi's and al-Farrā's explanations of the *naṣb* mood following the conjunctions: both contend that the utterance following the conjunction differs, or shifts (*yuṣrafu*), from the preceding utterance. The formal reason for this mood, however, is in dispute between these grammarians in particular and the Baṣran and Kūfan schools in general, as shown above. It therefore seems inappropriate to ignore the fundamental difference between the Baṣrans' theory of '*an muḍmara* and the Kūfans' view of *ṣarf/xilāf*.⁹²

14. TAQDĪR

*Taqdīr*⁹³ is one of the basic notions in Arabic grammar and plays a fundamental role in many grammatical explanations. The theory of *taqdīr* is closely linked to the notions of '*amal* and '*idmār* (see §1 and §3, respectively). *Taqdīr* basically means that a literal utterance can be intended to express another utterance, different in structure but not in meaning. If we designate the literal utterance as "X" and its corresponding imaginary counterpart as "Y", we can say that the main idea of the theory of *taqdīr* is that the speaker intends, or imagines, that when he says "X", it is as if

⁹¹ See chapter 5, §4, chapter 6, §7 and chapter 7, §6.

⁹² Cf. Versteegh, *Grammar*, 10–11, where the author presents Carter's and other scholars' views on this issue and emphasizes that the essential difference between Sibawayhi's and al-Farrā's theories should not be disregarded.

⁹³ For the various literal meanings of this term, see *EALL* IV, 446a, s.v. *Taqdīr*, beginning of entry.

he were saying “Y”. The notion of *taqdīr* was developed by grammarians in order to solve a theoretical difficulty, and they apply it when they find that the literal construction of a given utterance does not accord with their grammatical theories. According to the grammarians’ view, the relevant construction for the grammatical analysis is that of the *taqdīr* and not the literal utterance.⁹⁴ In this book the notion of *taqdīr* is mainly relevant to the *ʿan muḍmara* which is taken as inducing the *naṣb* mood in many instances (see §3.1).

15. WĀJIB, ĠAYR WĀJIB

The term *wājib*, an active participle of the verb *wajaba*, literary means ‘necessary, requisite or obligatory’.⁹⁵ It is relevant mainly to the *naṣb* mood following the conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*; many grammarians, beginning with Sibawayhi, state that a prerequisite for *naṣb* in the verb following these conjunctions is that the preceding utterance be *ġayr wājib* ‘not *wājib*’. One of the earliest definitions of this term is al-Fārisī’s, who says in his discussion of *fa-* followed by a *manṣūb* verb: *fa-l-wājibu l-xabaru l-muṭbatu dūna l-manfiyyi* ‘the [utterance which is] *wājib* is a declarative sentence⁹⁶ which denotes certainty and is not negated’.⁹⁷ *Wājib* can thus be understood as an indicative sentence denoting certainty.

16. XILĀF

The word *xilāf* is the verbal noun of the transitive verb *xālaḥa* meaning ‘to disagree with, differ from or dissent from’.⁹⁸ According to al-Farrā’, *xilāf* ‘disagreement, difference’ is the factor which induces the *naṣb* mood in the imperfect verb following any of the conjunctions, as well as the *naṣb* case in the noun following *al-mafʿūl maʿahu*. In his discussions of

⁹⁴ For a brief explanation of the notion of *taqdīr* see Levin, *Two passages*, 108–109, §3. See further Levin, *Taqdīr*; EALL IV, 446a, s.v. *Taqdīr*; EP X, 119b–121b, s.v. *Taqdīr*, §1.

⁹⁵ See Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2923b, 8–10.

⁹⁶ According to Levin, *Mabniyy*, 330, 14–15, *ḫabar* is the most usual term in the *Kitāb* to denote the category of declarative sentences (for references see note 173 there). Cf. Levin, *ʿAsmāʾ*, 248, note 8; EALL IV, 737a, s.v. *ḫabar*, §1.

⁹⁷ See al-Fārisī, *ʿIdāḥ* II, 1061, 1–2. See also Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* I, 61, 11ff. (chapter 34), where *wājib* occurs several times with respect to various sentence types. See further Lane, *Lexicon* VIII, 2923b, s.v. *wājib*, end of entry, where *fiʿl wājib* is defined as ‘A verb expressing an event as a positive fact’.

⁹⁸ See Lane, *Lexicon* II, 794a–b.

the *naṣb* mood following the various conjunctions, al-Farrā' often generalizes the discussed specific case to all conjunctions. For example, he is quoted as saying with respect to the conjunctions: *al-'aḡ'ālu ba'da hādīhi l-'aḡrufi muntaṣibatun 'alā l-xilāfi* 'the verbs following these particles (i.e. the conjunctions) take *naṣb* due to *xilāf*'.⁹⁹ *Xilāf* stands for a difference of meaning between what precedes and what follows the conjunction, as explained below.

In his commentaries on a number of Qur'ānic verses in which the conjunction *fa-* is followed by a *manṣūb* verb, al-Farrā' explains what he means by *xilāf*. In one of his discussions he explains the *naṣb* mood as follows: *falamā 'uṭifa ḥarfūn 'alā ḡayri mā yuṣākiluhu wakāna fi 'awwalīhi ḥādīṭun lā yaṣluḥu fi l-tānī nuṣiba* 'when a word is connected to [a preceding word] which is not equivalent to it, and its beginning (i.e. the beginning of the utterance, or of the first word) consists of an element with a syntactic effect¹⁰⁰ which is not appropriate (i.e. not applicable) for the second [word], it (i.e. the second word) takes *naṣb*'.¹⁰¹

Note that with respect to the *naṣb* mood following *wa-* in particular and the conjunctions in general, al-Farrā' uses the term *ṣarf* and defines it very similarly to *xilāf* (see §13). Indeed, some grammarians interpret *ṣarf* as a synonym of *xilāf*.¹⁰² For Carter's discussion of these two terms, see §13 above.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Al-Farrā' is quoted in al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998) IV, 54, –1–55, 3. Cf. Ibn 'Uṣṣūr, *Šarḥ* II, 141, 2–5; al-Suyūṭī, *'Aṣbāḥ* (1998) I, 519, 8–520, 7.

¹⁰⁰ See note 82 above.

¹⁰¹ See al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī* I, 27, 2–3. Cf. al-Farrā' quoted in Jahn, *Translation* II.2, 87, note 4 of chapter 241 and in al-Baṭalyawṣī, *'Islāḥ*, 245, –1–246, 10.

¹⁰² See, for example, al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb* II, 40, 9. Another evidence for the interchangeability of these two terms is that some grammarians, like Ibn Jinnī and Ibn Ya'īš, present their criticism of the explanation of *ṣarf* with respect to *naṣb* following *fa-* (for references see note 90), whereas others use the term *xilāf* in the context of *fa-* (see al-Farrā's excerpt quoted above and the references in chapter 6, §7.3.2).

¹⁰³ For additional modern scholars' explanations on *xilāf* see Dīrah, *Naḥw*, 286–288; Maw'id, *al-Anbārī*, 114–115, where the author relies mainly on the early grammarian Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim Abū Bakr, Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 328 AH). See also al-Maxzūmī, *Qaḍāyā*, 111–119 and al-Maxzūmī, *Kūfa*, 364ff., where the author unsuccessfully tries to prove that the origin of *xilāf* lies in al-Xalīl's statements on 'illā (al-Maxzūmī's explanations are inadequate due to two reasons: first, in his discussions of 'illā al-Xalīl does not use at all the term *xilāf* but the word *muxraj*; secondly, as al-Maxzūmī himself acknowledges, the Kūfans themselves do not use the term *xilāf* in their discussions of 'illā).

APPENDIX B

GRAMMARIANS' BIOGRAPHIES

1. INTRODUCTION

This appendix lists the grammarians and lexicographers who are quoted or mentioned in the text. The list is sorted alphabetically according to the abbreviations used throughout the work. Each entry contains the person's biographical details and the authored books from which I quote. The alphabetical list is followed by a chronologically sorted key.

2. GRAMMARIANS' BIOGRAPHIES IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

2.1. *Abū Ḥayyān*

Full name: Abū Ḥayyān, Aṭīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ġarnāṭī. The most distinguished Arab grammarian of the first half of the 14th century. Born in Granada, 654/1256, died in Cairo, 745/1344. Purported to have written 65 works, many of them multi-volumed, on Arabic and other languages (notably Turkish, Ethiopic, and Persian), Qur'ānic studies, traditions, jurisprudence, history, biography and poetry.¹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Irtiṣāf al-ḍarab min lisān al-ʿarab*, a comprehensive grammatical treatise.
- b. *Manhaj al-sālik*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik's *ʿAlfiyya* (see §2.31-a).
- c. *Al-Tadrīb fī tamṭīl al-taqrīb*, a commentary on his *Taqrīb al-muqarrib* (see e. below).
- d. *Al-Taḍyīl wal-takmīl fī šarḥ kitāb al-tashīl*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik's *Tashīl* (see §2.31-f).
- e. *Taqrīb al-muqarrib*, a summary of Ibn ʿUṣfūr's *Muqarrib* (see §2.42-b).

¹ See *El*² I, 126, s.v. Abū Ḥayyān; Abū Ḥayyān, *Taqrīb*, 5–27.

2.2. *Al-Ardabīlī*

Full name: al-Ardabīlī, Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Šams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ġanī. There are varying opinions on his identity and lifetime. According to Ḥājjī Xalifa’s *Kašf* it is Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Ġanī l-Ardabīlī, who died 647/1249–1250,² but according to de Sacy’s and Brockelmann’s opinion, to which I adhere, it is Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Šams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ġanī l-Ardabīlī, who died 1036/1626.³ Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-’Unmūdaj*, a commentary on al-Zamaxšarī’s *’Unmūdaj* (see §2.94-e).

2.3. *Al-Astarābādī*

Full name: al-Astarābādī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. Died 684/1285 or 686/1288.⁴

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Šarḥ al-kāfiya*, a commentary on Ibn al-Ḥājjib’s *Kāfiya* (see §2.28-c).⁵ Al-Astarābādī’s commentary is one of the most important primary sources of this study.
- b. *Šarḥ al-šāfiya*, a commentary on Ibn al-Ḥājjib’s *Šāfiya*, which is devoted to morphology.

2.4. *Al-Axfaš*

Full name: al-Axfaš al-Awsat, Abū l-Ḥasan Sa‘īd b. Mas‘ada. One of Sibawayhi’s prominent disciples. Died between 210–221/825–835.⁶

Work quoted in this study: *Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān*, a book on grammatical problems found in Qur’ānic verses.⁷

² See Ḥājjī Xalifa, *Kašf* I, 185.

³ See de Sacy, *Anthologie*, 267–270; Brockelmann, *GAL* I, 347. Cf. Brockelmann, *GAL* S. I, 510, where another possibility is mentioned, according to which al-Ardabīlī lived before 886/1481.

⁴ See *ET*² I, 721a, s.v. al-Astarābādī.

⁵ I used the 1979 edition, which seems to be more reliable (*Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979)), and the 1998 edition, which is more comfortable to use due to a separation between Ibn al-Ḥājjib’s and al-Astarābādī’s statements (al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998)).

⁶ See *ET*² I, 321a, s.v. al-Akhfaš al-Awsat; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 68–69; Howell, *Grammar* I.1, Bibliographical references, §iv.

⁷ I used mainly the 1985 edition (al-Axfaš, *Ma‘ānī* (1985)), and compared it to the 1981 edition (al-Axfaš, *Ma‘ānī* (1981)). I hardly used the 1990 edition (al-Axfaš, *Ma‘ānī* (1990)) in which complete paragraphs are missing, in comparison with the 1981 and 1985 editions.

2.5. *Al-ʿAynī*

Full name: al-ʿAynī, Abū Muḥammad Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad b. Mūsā Badr al-Dīn. Born 762/1361, at ʿAynṭāb, a place situated between Aleppo and Antioch, died 855/1451.⁸

Work quoted in this study: *al-Maqāṣid al-naḥwīyya*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in four commentaries on Ibn Mālik's *ʿAlfiyya* (see §2.31-a): Ibn al-Nāẓim's (see §2.34), al-Murādī's (see §2.61), Ibn Hišām's (see §2.29-a) and Ibn ʿAqīl's (see §2.23-b). Al-ʿAynī's *Maqāṣid* is one of the best sources for understanding the poetry which grammarians quote.

2.6. *Al-Azharī (later grammarian)*

Full name: al-Azharī, Xālid b. ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Bakr. Born in Jirjā in Upper Egypt (whence is derived the ethnic appellation al-Jarjāwī which is sometimes applied to him), 838/1434, died in Cairo, 905/1499.⁹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Muwaṣṣil al-ṭullāb*, a commentary on Ibn Hišām's *Qawāʿid al-ʿiṣṣāb* (see §2.29-b).
- b. *Šarḥ al-ʿawāmil al-miʿa*, a commentary on al-Jurjānī's *Miʿat ʿāmil* (see §2.54-d).
- c. *Al-Taṣrīḥ bimaḍmūn al-tawḍīḥ*, a super-commentary on Ibn Hišām's commentary *ʿAwḍaḥ al-masālik* on Ibn Mālik's *ʿAlfiyya* (see §2.29-a and §2.31-a, respectively).

2.7. *Al-Azharī (lexicographer)*

Full name: al-Azharī, Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Azhar. Born in Harāt, 282/895, died there, 370/980.¹⁰

Work quoted in this study: *Tahdīb al-luġa*, a comprehensive dictionary which continues the tradition initiated by al-Xalīl in his *Kitāb al-ʿayn* (see §2.87); the roots are not arranged in the usual alphabetical order, but in accordance with a phonetic classification, commencing with the gutturals and ending with the labials. The *Tahdīb* was copiously used by Ibn Manẓūr in his *Lisān al-ʿarab* (see §2.32).

⁸ See *ET*² I, 790–791, s.v. al-ʿAynī; al-ʿAynī, *Maqāṣid* I, 2–5.

⁹ See *ET*² I, 821b–822a, s.v. al-Azharī, Xālid [sic] b. ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Bakr; al-Azharī, *Šarḥ*, 45–52.

¹⁰ See *ET*² I, 822a, s.v. al-Azharī, Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Azhar; Sezgin, *GAS* VIII, 201–205.

2.8. *Al-Baġdādī*

Full name: al-Baġdādī, ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Umar. Born in Baghdad, 1030/1621, died in Cairo, 1093/1682.¹¹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Šarḥ šawāhid šarḥ al-tuḥfa l-wardiyya*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in Ibn al-Wardī’s *Šarḥ al-tuḥfa l-wardiyya* (see §2.43).
- b. *Xizānat al-‘adab*, a commentary on the 957 lines of poetry quoted by al-Astarābādī in his commentary on Ibn al-Ḥāġib’s *Kāfiya* (see §2.3-a). This work contains quotations from numerous early writings and is one of the best sources not only for understanding the poetry which grammarians quote but also their views.

2.9. *Al-Baṭalyawsī*

Full name: al-Baṭalyawsī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Sīd. Born in Badajoz (Baṭalyaws), 444/1052, died in Valencia, 521/1127.¹²

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Ḥulal fī šarḥ ‘abyāt al-jumal*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in al-Zajjājī’s *Jumal* (see §2.93-b).
- b. *‘Iṣlāḥ al-xalal al-wāqi‘ fī l-jumal lil-Zajjājī*, a commentary and criticism of al-Zajjājī’s *Jumal*, mentioned in a. above.

2.10. *Al-Bustānī*

Full name: al-Bustānī, Buṭrus b. Būlus. Born in Dibbiyya, 1234/1819, died 1300/1883.¹³

Work quoted in this study: *Muḥīṭ al-muḥīṭ*, a dictionary published in 1870.

2.11. *Al-Ḍarīr*

Full name: al-Ḍarīr al-Wāsiṭī, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Mubāšir Abū Naṣr. Lived before 469/1077 and died in Egypt, exact date of death unknown, ca. 430/1038.¹⁴

¹¹ See *ET*² I, 68a, s.v. ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Umar al-Baġdādī.

¹² See *ET*² I, 1092b, s.v. al-Baṭalyawsī; al-Baṭalyawsī, *Šarḥ*, 5–10.

¹³ See *ET*² XII, 159–160, s.v. al-Bustānī, §2. Buṭrus b. Būlus al-Bustānī.

¹⁴ See Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 212; al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 9–10.

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-lumaʿ fi l-naḥw*, an excellent commentary on Ibn Jinnī's *Lumaʿ* (see §2.30-a). Al-Ḍarīr's commentary often contains original ideas and views.

Note that another later commentator on Ibn Jinnī's *Lumaʿ* has a similar name: al-Wāsiṭī, Qāsim b. al-Qāsim, died 626/1228–1229.¹⁵ The editor of al-Ḍarīr's *Šarḥ* argues, based on the manuscripts which he used for preparing the edition, that the author must be the earlier commentator mentioned at the beginning of this section.¹⁶

2.12. *Al-Fākihī*

Full name: al-Fākihī, ʿAbdallāh b. Aḥmad Abū ʿAlī Jamāl al-Dīn. Born 899/1494, died 972/1565.¹⁷

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-fawākih al-janiyya ʿalā mutammimat al-ʾājurrūmiyya*, a commentary on a supplement to Ibn ʾĀjurrūm's *ʾĀjurrūmiyya*,¹⁸ written by al-Ruʾaynī, a contemporary of al-Fākihī (Ibn ʾĀjurrūm died 723/1323 and al-Ruʾaynī died 954/1547). Parts of al-Fākihī's *Šarḥ* seem to be copied from other books.

2.13. *Al-Fārisī*

Full name: al-Fārisī, Abū ʿAlī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Ġaffār. Born in Fasā, 288/900, died in Baghdad, 377/987. Studied at Baghdad under Ibn al-Sarrāj (see §2.38), al-Zajjāj (see §2.92) and others. Amongst his numerous pupils were Ibn Jinnī, who attended him for 40 years and became his successor (see §2.30), and his nephew Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Fārisī, who became the teacher of ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (see §2.54).¹⁹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-ʾĪḍāḥ*, an advanced grammar. *Al-ʾĪḍāḥ* has several commentaries, three of which were used in this study: al-Jurjānī's, Ibn al-Ṭarāwa's and Ibn Abī Rabī's, as well as Ibn Barī's commentary on the poetry quoted in this book.
- b. *Al-ʾIḡfāl*, a commentary on al-Zajjāj's *Maʿānī l-Qurʾān* (see §2.92-b).
- c. *Al-Masāʾil al-baġdādīyyāt*, a book on a number of grammatical issues.

¹⁵ See Ḥājjī Xalīfa, *Kašf* II, 1562; 1789.

¹⁶ See al-Ḍarīr, *Šarḥ*, 35–36; 11; 14. Cf. Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 212.

¹⁷ See al-Fākihī, *Šarḥ*, 4–5.

¹⁸ See *El*² III, 697, s.v. Ibn ʾĀjurrūm.

¹⁹ See *El*² II, 802–803, s.v. al-Fārisī, Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 101–110.

- d. *Al-Masā'il al-baṣriyyāt*, a book on a number of grammatical issues.
- e. *Al-Masā'il al-ḥalabīyyāt*, a book on a number of grammatical issues.
- f. *Al-Masā'il al-manṭūra*, a book on a number of grammatical issues.
- g. *Šarḥ al-'abyāt*, a commentary on grammatically difficult lines of poetry.
- h. *Al-Ta'līqā 'alā kitāb Sibawayhi*, a commentary on a number of issues from Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).

2.14. *Al-Farrā'*

Full name: al-Farrā', Abū Zakariyyā' Yaḥyā b. Ziyād. Born in Kūfa, ca. 144/761, died 207/822.²⁰

Work quoted in this study: *Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān*, a book on grammatical problems found in Qur'ānic verses; it contains many explanations for grammatical phenomena. For additional information see preface, §2.1.1.2.

2.15. *Al-Fayyūmī*

Full name: al-Fayyūmī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī l-Muqri'. Died after 770/1368.²¹

Work quoted in this study: *al-Miṣbāḥ al-munūr*, a dictionary devoted to the technical vocabulary of Islamic jurisprudence.²² It is an abridged version of al-Rāfi'ī's (died 623/1226) dictionary *Šarḥ al-Wajīz*, which as a commentary on al-Ġazzālī's *al-Wajīz* contained a large number of technical terms from *fiqh*.²³

2.16. *Al-Firūzābādī*

Full name: al-Firūzābādī, Abū l-Ṭāhir Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Majd al-Dīn al-Šāfi'ī l-Šīrāzī. Born in Kāzarūn, a town near Šīrāz (Iran) 729/1329, died 817/1415.²⁴

Work quoted in this study: the dictionary *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*.²⁵

²⁰ See Kinberg, *al-Farrā'*, 9–23; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 131–134. See also *El*² II, 806–808, s.v. al-Farrā', where al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī* is criticized in strong terms, unjustifiably in my view, and described as 'highly disappointing and without any general theme' (see *ibid.*, 807, –5ff.).

²¹ See Brockelmann, *GAL* II, 31, §8; Sezgin, *GAS* VIII, 14.

²² See *EALL* III, 30a, s.v. Lexicography: Classical Arabic (end of §4).

²³ See *EALL* III, 37b, s.v. Lexicography: Monolingual Dictionaries (towards the end of §3.4).

²⁴ See *El*² II, 926–927, s.v. al-Firūzābādī.

²⁵ I used mainly the 1913 edition (al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913)), and compared it to the 1987 edition (al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1987)).

2.17. *Al-Harawī*

Full name: al-Harawī, 'Alī b. Muḥammad Abū l-Ḥasan. Lived before 370/980–981, died most probably in the fifth century AH, ca. 410/1019.²⁶

Work quoted in this study: *al-'Azhiya fī 'ilm al-ḥurūf*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.

2.18. *Al-Ḥarīrī*

Full name: al-Ḥarīrī, Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Uṭmān b. al-Ḥarīrī l-Baṣrī. Arabic poet and philologist known principally for his *Maqāmāt*. Born 446/1054, died 516/1122.²⁷

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Durrat al-ḡawwāṣ fī 'awḥām al-xawāss*, a collection of critical notes on the incorrect use of certain expressions.
- b. *Šarḥ mulḥat al-'i'rāb*, a commentary on his *Mulḥat al-'i'rāb*, which is a didactic 'urjūza on grammar.

2.19. *Al-Ḥimyarī*

Full name: al-Ḥimyarī, Našwān b. Sa'īd b. Našwān l-Yamanī. Died ca. 573/1178.²⁸

Work quoted in this study: the dictionary *Šams al-'ulūm wadawā' kalām al-'arab min al-kulūm*.²⁹

2.20. *Hišām b. Mu'āwiya*

Full name: Hišām b. Mu'āwiya l-Ḍarīr Abū 'Abdallāh al-Kūfī. One of al-Kisā'ī's disciples. Died 209/824.³⁰ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

²⁶ See Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 211–212; al-Harawī, *'Azhiya*, 6ff. The estimated year of death is according to Sezgin; Ḥājjī Khalifa and Brockelmann do not mention when he died. See Ḥājjī Khalifa, *Kašf* I, 73; 822; Brockelmann, *GAL* II, 919, §43.

²⁷ See *EI*² III, 221–222, s.v. al-Ḥarīrī.

²⁸ See *EI*² VII, 976–977, s.v. Našwān b. Sa'īd b. Našwān al-Ḥimyarī al-Yamanī.

²⁹ I used mainly the 1999 edition (al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1999)), and compared it, when possible, to the incomplete 1951 edition (al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1951)).

³⁰ See Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 134; Howell, *Grammar* I.1, Bibliographical references, §ix, –3; §xxviii, 24.

2.21. *Ibn Abī Rabīʿ*

Full name: Ibn Abī Rabīʿ, ʿUbayd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. ʿUbayd Allāh al-Iṣbīlī l-Quraṣī l-Sabtī. Born 599/1202–1203, died 688/1289.³¹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Basīṭ fī šarḥ jumal al-Zajjājī*, a commentary on al-Zajjājī's *Jumal* (see §2.93-b).
- b. *Al-Kāfī fī l-ʿifṣāḥ ʿan masāʾil kitāb al-ʾiḍāḥ*, a commentary on al-Fārisī's *ʾIḍāḥ* (see §2.13-a).

2.22. *Ibn al-Anbārī*

Full name: Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Abī Saʿīd Kamāl al-Dīn. Born 513/1119, died 577/1181.³²

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *ʾAsrār al-ʿarabiyya*, a concise grammatical treatise.
- b. *Al-Bayān fī ġarīb ʾiʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, a commentary on the Qurʾān which also contains explanations of grammatical phenomena.
- c. *Al-ʾInṣāf fī masāʾil al-xilāf bayn al-naḥwīyyīna l-baṣriyyīna wal-kūfiyyīna*, a book on the disputes among the schools of Baṣra and Kūfa.
- d. *Lumaʿ al-ʾadilla fī ʾuṣūl al-naḥw*, a book which deals in argumentation and evidence in grammatical discussions.³³

2.23. *Ibn ʿAqīl*

Full name: Ibn ʿAqīl, ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbdallāh Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-Hāšimī. Born 694/1294 (or, according to some, 698 or 700 AH), died 769/1367.³⁴

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Musāʾid ʾalā tashīl al-fawāʾid*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik's *Tashīl al-fawāʾid* (see §2.31-f).

³¹ See Ibn Abī Rabīʿ, *Kāfī*, 67ff.

³² See *El*² I, 485b–486a, s.v. Ibn al-Anbārī.

³³ I used mainly the 1963 edition (Ibn al-Anbārī, *Lumaʿ* (1963)), and compared it to the 1957 edition (Ibn al-Anbārī, *Lumaʿ* (1957)).

³⁴ See *El*² III, 698–699, s.v. Ibn ʿAqīl.

- b. *Šarḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, one of the most famous and popular commentaries on Ibn Mālik's *'Alfiyya* (see §2.31-a).³⁵

2.24. *Ibn Bābašād*

Full name: Ibn Bābašād, Ṭāhir b. Aḥmad Abū l-Ḥasan al-Naḥwī l-Miṣrī. Died 469/1077.³⁶ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

2.25. *Ibn Barrī*

Full name: Ibn Barrī, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Barrī b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Maqdisī l-Miṣrī l-Šāfi'ī. Born in Cairo, 499/1106, died there, 582/1187.³⁷

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ šawāhid al-īdāḥ*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in al-Fārisī's *īdāḥ* (see §2.13-a).

2.26. *Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī*

Full name: Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Wāḥid b. 'Alī b. 'Umar b. Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Asadī. Born around the end of the third quarter of the fourth century AH and died 456/1063–1064, being more than 80 years old.³⁸

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-luma'*, a commentary on Ibn Jinnī's *Luma'* (see §2.30-a).

2.27. *Ibn Fāris*

Full name: Ibn Fāris, Abū l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Fāris b. Zakariyyā' b. Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb. Born between 306–308/918–920, died 395/1004.³⁹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Mujmal al-luḡa*, a dictionary of brief definitions.
- b. *Al-Šāḥibī fī fiqh al-luḡa*, a book which aims at gathering together the Arabs' ideas regarding language in general and their Arabic language in particular.

³⁵ Note that the commentary's editor has also published its translation into German (Dieterici, *Translation*).

³⁶ See *ET*² X, 102, s.v. Ṭāhir b. Aḥmad b. Bābašād.

³⁷ See *ET*² III, 733, s.v. Ibn Barrī; Ibn Barrī, *Šarḥ*, 2–7.

³⁸ See Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ* I, 15ff. (first numbering).

³⁹ See *ET*² III, 764–765, s.v. Ibn Fāris; Sezgin, *GAS* VIII, 209–214; IX, 194; Ibn Fāris, *Šāḥibī*, 5ff.

2.28. *Ibn al-Ḥāḡib*

Full name: Ibn al-Ḥāḡib, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr ‘Utmān b. ‘Umar b. Abī Bakr al-Mālikī. Born in Asnā, a village in Upper Egypt, after 570/1174–1175, died in Alexandria, 646/1249.⁴⁰

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *‘Amālī Ibn al-Ḥāḡib*, a book on various grammatical issues. Its first part is devoted to the Qur’ān, and its second to al-Zamaxšarī’s *Mufaṣṣal* (see §2.94-b).
- b. *Al-‘Īdāḡ fi šarḡ al-mufaṣṣal*, an excellent commentary on al-Zamaxšarī’s *Mufaṣṣal* (see also a. above).
- c. *Al-Kāfiya fi l-naḡw*, a comprehensive syntax book, to which numerous commentaries were written, the best of which is al-Astarābādī’s, which I used (see §2.3-a and note 5). I also used Šalāḡ al-Dīn’s and al-Jāmī’s commentaries, as well as al-Baḡdādī’s commentary on the poetry quoted in this book.

2.29. *Ibn Hišām*

Full name: Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḡammad ‘Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḡmad b. ‘Abdallāh. Born in Cairo, 708/1310, died 761/1360.⁴¹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *‘Awḡaḡ al-masālik*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik’s *‘Alfiyya* (see §2.31-a).
- b. *Al-‘Īrāb ‘an qawā‘id al-‘i‘rāb*, a concise grammar.
- c. *Al-Jāmī‘ al-šaḡīr fi l-naḡw*, a concise grammar.
- d. *Muḡnī l-labīb ‘an kutub al-‘a‘ārib*, a famous book devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.⁴² I used al-Suyūṭī’s commentary on the poetry quoted in this book.
- e. *Šarḡ jumal al-Zajjājī*, a commentary on al-Zajjājī’s *Jumal* (see §2.93-b).
- f. *Šarḡ qaṭr al-nadā waball al-šadā*, a commentary on his syntax book *Qaṭr al-nadā*.⁴³

⁴⁰ See *ET*² III, 781, s.v. Ibn al-Ḥāḡib. See also al-Jāmī, *Šarḡ* I, 9–17, where the editor mentions some studies devoted to Ibn al-Ḥāḡib (see *ibid.*, 9, note 2).

⁴¹ See *ET*² III, 801–802, s.v. Ibn Hišām.

⁴² I used mainly the 1910 edition (Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1910)), but also the 1995 edition (Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī* (1995)), which is available as electronic edition.

⁴³ I used both the 1848 edition (Ibn Hišām, *Šarḡ qaṭr* (1848)) and the 1963 edition (Ibn Hišām, *Šarḡ qaṭr* (1963)).

- g. *Šarḥ šuḍūr al-ḍahab fī maʿrifat kalām al-ʿarab*, a commentary on his syntax book *Šuḍūr al-ḍahab*.
- h. *Taxlīš al-šawāhid wataxīs al-fawāʿid*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in Ibn Mālik's *ʿAlfiyya* (see §2.31-a).

2.30. *Ibn Jinnī*

Full name: Ibn Jinnī, ʿUṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. A famous disciple of al-Fārisī (see §2.13). Born in Mosul before 300/913, died 392/1002.⁴⁴

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Lumaʿ fī l-naḥw*, a general concise grammar. *Al-Lumaʿ* has several commentaries, four of which were used in this study: al-Ḍarīr's, Ibn Burhān al-ʿUkbarī's, al-Šarīf al-Kūfī's and Ibn al-Xabbāz's.
- b. *Al-Muḥtasab fī tabyīn wujūh šawādd al-qirāʾāt wal-ʿidāḥ ʿanhā*, devoted to exceptional readings of Qurʾānic verses and their grammatical explanations.
- c. *Al-Munšif*, a commentary on al-Māzinī's *Tašrif* devoted to morphology (see §2.59).
- d. *Sirr šināʿat al-ʿirāb*, a comprehensive grammar sorted alphabetically.
- e. *Al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, devoted to the philosophy of language.⁴⁵

2.31. *Ibn Mālik*

Full name: Ibn Mālik, Abū ʿAbdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭāʾī l-Jayyānī. Born in Jaen (south Spain) between 600–601/1203–1205, died 672/1274.⁴⁶

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-ʿAlfiyya*, a résumé of his *al-Kāfiya l-šāfiya* (see b. below) in about a thousand verses (in the *rajaz* meter), perhaps in imitation of Ibn Muʿṭī's *al-Durra l-ʿalfiyya* (see §2.33-a). The *ʿAlfiyya* has been the subject of at least 43 commentaries, eight of which were used in this study: Ibn al-Nāẓim's, Abū Ḥayyān's, Ibn Hišām's, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya's, Ibn ʿAqīl's, al-Makkūdī's, al-Ušmūnī's and al-Suyūṭī's, and in addition, al-ʿAynī's commentary on the poetry quoted in four of them.

⁴⁴ See *ET*² III, 754, s.v. Ibn ḌJinnī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 173–182.

⁴⁵ I used the 1990 edition (Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* (1990)), but compared it to the 2001 edition (Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* (2001)), which contains an excellent subjects index.

⁴⁶ See *ET*² III, 861–862, s.v. Ibn Mālik; al-Ušmūnī, *Šarḥ* I, 5–8.

- b. *Šarḥ al-kāfiya*, a commentary on his *al-Kāfiya l-šāfiya*, a treatise on grammar in about three thousand verses (in the *rajaz* meter).
- c. *Šarḥ al-tashīl*, a commentary on his *Tashīl al-fawā'id watakmi' al-maqāšid* (see f. below).
- d. *Šarḥ 'umdat al-ḥāfiẓ wa'uddat al-lāfiẓ*, a commentary on his *'Umdat al-ḥāfiẓ*, a résumé of syntax.
- e. *Šawāhid al-tawḍīḥ wal-taṣḥīḥ limuškilāt al-jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, a grammatical discussion of difficult passages from al-Buxārī's *al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*.
- f. *Tashīl al-fawā'id watakmi' al-maqāšid*, a résumé of an earlier grammatical work, *al-Fawā'id fi l-naḥw*. *Tashīl al-fawā'id* had a great reputation; there are at least 29 commentaries, three of which were used in this study: Ibn Mālik's own commentary, Abū Ḥayyān's and Ibn 'Aqīl's.

2.32. *Ibn Manẓūr*

Full name: Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram b. 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Anṣārī l-Ifriqī l-Miṣrī Jamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl. Born 630/1233, died 711/1311–1312.⁴⁷

Work quoted in this study: *Lisān al-'arab*, the famous dictionary which was completed in 689/1290.⁴⁸ *Lisān al-'arab* is based on five earlier dictionaries, viz. al-Azharī's *Tahḍīb al-luġa*, Ibn Sīda's *Muḥkam*, al-Jawharī's *Tāj al-luġa* (whom he followed in arranging the roots according to the third radical), Ibn Barrī's glosses to al-Jawharī's *Tāj al-luġa* and Ḍahabī's *Nihāya* (the first three were also directly used in this study).

2.33. *Ibn Mu'ṭī*

Full name: Ibn Mu'ṭī, Abū l-Ḥusayn Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Nūr Zayn al-Dīn al-Zawāwī. Born 564/1168–1169, died in Cairo, 628/1231.⁴⁹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Durra l-'alfiyya fi 'ilm al-'arabiyya*, probably the first grammatical treatise in one thousand verses ('*alfiyya*'). It was finished in 595/1198–1199 and has been the subject of numerous commentaries, from which I use Ibn al-Xabbāz's.
- b. *Al-Fuṣūl al-xamsūna*, a grammatical treatise in prose.

⁴⁷ See *El*² III, 864b, s.v. Ibn Manẓūr.

⁴⁸ I used the 1955–1956 edition (Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1956)), the 1981–1986 edition (Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān* (1986)) and the excellent index to this dictionary (Abū l-Hayjā, *Fahāris*).

⁴⁹ See *El*² III, 893b, s.v. Ibn Mu'ṭī; Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 7ff.

2.34. *Ibn al-Nāẓim*

Full name: Ibn al-Nāẓim, Abū 'Abdallāh Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad, the son of the famous Ibn Mālik, author of the rhymed 'Alfiyya, and therefore known as Ibn al-Nāẓim 'the son of the rhymer'. Born ca. 640/1240, died in Damascus, 686/1287.⁵⁰

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-'alfiyya*, a commentary on his father's 'Alfiyya (see §2.31-a).

2.35. *Ibn Qutayba*

Full name: Ibn Qutayba, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawārī. Theologian and writer of 'adab. Born in Kūfa, 213/828, died in Baghdad, 276/889.⁵¹

Work quoted in this study: *Talqīn al-muta'allim fi l-naḥw*, a book attributed to him, although Lecomte characterizes it as one of 'the apocryphal works'.⁵²

2.36. *Ibn Rušd*

Full name: Ibn Rušd, Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Rušd, al-Ḥafīd. Born in Cordova, 520/1126, died in Marrakesh, 595/1198. Famous in the Mediaeval West under the name of Averroes, scholar of the Qur'ānic sciences and the natural sciences, theologian and philosopher.⁵³

Work quoted in this study: the grammar *al-Ḍarūrī fi šinā'at al-naḥw*.

2.37. *Ibn al-Šajārī*

Full name: Ibn al-Šajārī l-Baġdādī, Abū l-Sa'ādāt Hibat Allāh b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Ḥamza. Born 450/1058, died 542/1148. Grammarian and poet, descendent of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, taught grammar for 70 years.⁵⁴

Work quoted in this study: *al-'Amālī l-šajariyya*, a dictation of some of his lectures.

⁵⁰ See Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, V–XI.

⁵¹ See *ET*² III, 844–847, s.v. Ibn Qūṭayba; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 154–158.

⁵² See *ET*² III, 845b, s.v. Ibn Qūṭayba, (4). See also Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 154, note 1; Carter, *Experiment*.

⁵³ See *ET*² III, 909–920, s.v. Ibn Rušd, Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Rušd, al-Ḥafīd; Ibn Rušd, *Ḍarūrī*, 17ff.

⁵⁴ See *ET*² III, 934b, s.v. Ibn al-Šaḥājārī al-Baġdādī.

2.38. *Ibn al-Sarrāj*

Full name: Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarī l-Sarrāj al-Naḥwī l-Baġdādī. His date of birth is unknown; lived in Baghdad, was the youngest pupil of al-Mubarrad (see §2.60) and the teacher of several famous grammarians: al-Zajjājī (see §2.93), Abū Saʿīd al-Sirāfi (see §2.79), al-Rummānī (see §2.66) and al-Fārisī (see §2.13). Died 316/929.⁵⁵

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Mūjaz fī l-naḥw*, a résumé of his *ʿUṣūl* (see b. below).
- b. *Al-ʿUṣūl fī l-naḥw*, a grammar based on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77). This is one of the most important sources in this study.⁵⁶

2.39. *Ibn Sīda*

Full name: Ibn Sīda (Sīduh), Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. (Aḥmad b.?) Ismāʿīl. Andalusian philologist and lexicographer, born in Murcia, died at the age of about 60, 458/1066.⁵⁷

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Muḥkam wal-muḥīt al-ʿaḏam*, a dictionary based on previous dictionaries. It is one of the most important sources of Ibn Manẓūr's *Lisān al-ʿarab* (see §2.32).
- b. *Al-Muxaṣṣaṣ fī l-luġa*, an analogical dictionary compiled according to the plan of *al-Ġarīb al-muṣannaḑ*.

2.40. *Ibn Šuqayr*

Full name: Ibn Šuqayr, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-ʿAbbās b. al-Faraj al-Naḥwī l-Baġdādī. His date of birth is unknown; lived in Baghdad, died 317/929 or two years earlier.⁵⁸

Work quoted in this study: the grammar *al-Muḥallā: Wujūh al-naṣb*.

⁵⁵ See *El*² III, 930, s.v. Ibn al-Sarrādj; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 82–85.

⁵⁶ I used mainly the 1996 edition (Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1996)), but also the previous, 1973 edition (Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* (1973)). It is regrettable that both editions contain numerous errors.

⁵⁷ See *El*² III, 940, s.v. Ibn Sīda (Sīduh).

⁵⁸ See Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 162–163; Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*, 15–17.

2.41. *Ibn al-Ṭarāwa*

Full name: Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, Abū l-Ḥusayn Sulaymān b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn. Born in Malaga, date of birth unknown. A disciple of al-Šantamarī (see §2.72) in Seville, who taught him Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77). Died 528/1133–1134.⁵⁹

Work quoted in this study: *Risālat al-ʾiḡṣāḥ bibaʿd mā jāʾa min al-xaṭaʾ fi l-ʾiḡṣāḥ*, a commentary and criticism of al-Fārisi's *ʾIḡṣāḥ* (see §2.13-a).

2.42. *Ibn ʿUṣfūr*

Full name: Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muʾmin b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī. Born in Seville, 597/1200, studied under al-Šalawbīn, the most famous grammarian of the period (see §2.70). Died in Tunis, 670/1271.⁶⁰

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Ḍarāʾir al-šiʿr*, devoted to poetic license.
- b. *Al-Muqarrīb*, a grammar which Abū Ḥayyān summarized and commented on (see §2.1-e and §2.1-c, respectively).
- c. *Šarḥ jumal al-Zajjājī*, a commentary on al-Zajjājī's *Jumal* (see §2.93-b).

2.43. *Ibn al-Wardī*

Full name: Ibn al-Wardī, Zayn al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar b. Muzaḥḥar b. ʿUmar b. Abī l-Fawāris Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Wardī l-Qurašī l-Bakrī l-Šāfiʿī. Born in Maʿarrat al-Nuʾmān, 689 or 691/1290–1292, died in Aleppo, 749/1349.⁶¹

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-tuḥfa l-wardiyya*, a commentary on his *al-Tuḥfa l-wardiyya* which summarizes Arabic grammar in 153 rhymed verses.

2.44. *Ibn al-Xabbāz*

Full name: Ibn al-Xabbāz, Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn Ibn ʿAbdallāh Abū l-ʿAbbās. Date of birth unknown, died 637/1240 or two years later.⁶²

Works quoted in this study:

⁵⁹ See Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, *ʾIḡṣāḥ*, 6–8.

⁶⁰ See *ET*² III, 962b, s.v. Ibn ʿUṣfūr; Ḥājjī Xalifa, *Kaṣf* I, 603; Howell, *Grammar* I.1, Bibliographical references, §xv.

⁶¹ See *ET*² III, 966b, s.v. Ibn al-Wardī; Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*, 11–26.

⁶² See Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ* I, 16ff.

- a. *Al-Ġurra l-maxfiyya l Ibn al-Xabbāz fī šarḥ al-durra l-ʿalfiyya l Ibn Muʿtī*, a commentary on Ibn Muʿtī's *al-Durra l-ʿalfiyya* (see §2.33-a).
- b. *Tawjīh al-Lumaʿ*, a commentary on Ibn Jinnī's *Lumaʿ* (see §2.30-a).

2.45. *Ibn Xarūf*

Full name: Ibn Xarūf, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Ḥaḍramī l-Išbīlī. Died in Seville, between 606–610/1209–1213.⁶³

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ kitāb Sībawayhi l-musammā tanfīḥ al-ʿalbāb fī šarḥ ġawāmiḍ al-kitāb*, a commentary on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).

2.46. *Ibn al-Xaššāb*

Full name: Ibn al-Xaššāb, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Xaššāb. His place of birth is unknown; the date given for his birth, 492/1099, is not certain. Lived in Baghdad and died there, 567/1172.⁶⁴

Work quoted in this study: *al-Murtajal*, a commentary on al-Jurjānī's *Jumal* (see §2.54-a).

2.47. *Ibn Yaʿīš*

Full name: Ibn Yaʿīš, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū l-Baqāʾ Yaʿīš b. ʿAlī b. Yaʿīš al-Ḥalabī. Born in Aleppo, 553/1158, died there, 643/1245. Ibn Xallikān, Yāqūt and Ibn Mālik (see §2.31) were among his pupils.⁶⁵

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-mufašṣal*, the famous commentary on al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufašṣal* (see §2.94-b).

2.48. *Al-Irbilī*

Full name: al-Irbilī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn b. ʿAlī Ibn al-Imām Badr al-Dīn b. Muḥammad. Born 572/1176, died 631/1234 (or later).⁶⁶

Work quoted in this study: *Jawāhir al-ʿadab fī maʿrifat kalām al-ʿarab*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.

⁶³ See Ḥājji Xalifa, *Kašf* II, 1427; I, 602–603; Howell, *Grammar* I.1, Bibliographical references, §xiii.

⁶⁴ See *El*² III, 834, s.v. Ibn al-K~~H~~ashshāb; Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*, 5–26.

⁶⁵ See *El*² III, 968, s.v. Ibn Yaʿīsh.

⁶⁶ See al-Irbilī, *Jawāhir*, 11ff.

2.49. *ʿĪsā b. ʿUmar*

Full name: ʿĪsā b. ʿUmar al-Ṭaqafī. The teacher of both Sībawayhi and al-Xalīl, Sībawayhi's primary teacher (see §2.77 and §2.87, respectively), he was active in Baṣra, like Sībawayhi. Died 149/766.⁶⁷ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

2.50. *Al-Jāmī*

Full name: al-Jāmī, Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad. Born 817/1414, died 898/1492. A famous Persian poet, who also compiled one grammar from which I quote in this study: *al-Fawā'id al-dīyā'iyya: Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājjib*, a commentary on Ibn al-Ḥājjib's *Kāfiya* (see §2.28-c).⁶⁸

2.51. *Al-Jarmī*

Full name: al-Jarmī, Abū ʿUmar Šāliḥ b. Ishāq. His date of birth is unknown, died 225/839. Among his teachers were Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (see §2.90), who was also one of Sībawayhi's teachers, and al-Axfaš al-Awsaṭ (see §2.4). Among his pupils were al-Māzinī and al-Mubarrad (see §2.59 and §2.60, respectively). As far as it is known now, none of his books has been preserved.⁶⁹ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

2.52. *Al-Jawharī*

Full name: al-Jawharī, Abū Naṣr Ismā'īl (b. Naṣr?) b. Ḥammād. Born in Fārāb, exact date of birth unknown, died between 393–400/1002–1010.⁷⁰

Work quoted in this study: *Tāj al-luġa waṣaḥḥāḥ al-ʿarabiyya*, a famous dictionary which is one of the most important sources of Ibn Manẓūr's *Lisān al-ʿarab* (see §2.32).

⁶⁷ See *ET*² IV, 91a, s.v. ʿĪsā b. ʿUmar al-ṭḥaqafī al-baṣrī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 37–39; al-Sīrāfi, *ʿAxbār*, 48.

⁶⁸ See *ET*² II, 421–422, s.v. DJāmī; al-Jāmī, *Šarḥ* I, 47ff.

⁶⁹ See Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 72–73; Bernards, *al-Jarmī*, 35–36. For bibliographical references see *ibid.*, 42, note 1.

⁷⁰ See *ET*² II, 495–497, s.v. al-DJawharī; Sezgin, *GAS* VIII, 215–224.

2.53. *Al-Jawziyya, Ibn Qayyim*

Full name: Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Šams al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Zar‘ī. Born in Damascus, 691/1292, died there, 751/1350. Ḥanbalī theologian, but also the author of some grammars.⁷¹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *’Iršād al-sālik ’ilā ḥall ’alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik’s *’Alfiyya* (see §2.31-a).
- b. *Ma’ānī l-’adawāt wal-ḥurūf al-mansūb ilbn Qayyim al-Jawziyya*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.

2.54. *Al-Jurjānī*

Full name: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. Born in Gurgān, date of birth unknown, died 471/1078.⁷²

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Jumal fī l-naḥw*, a concise grammar which has several commentaries, three of which were used in this study: al-Jurjānī’s own commentary, Ibn al-Xaššāb’s and al-Xwārazmī’s.
- b. *Al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-’iḍāḥ*, a commentary on al-Fārisī’s *’Iḍāḥ* (see §2.13-a).
- c. *Šarḥ al-jumal*, a commentary on his *Jumal* (see a. above).
- d. *Šarḥ mi’at ’āmil*, a commentary on his *Mi’at ’āmil*, a concise and popular grammar on the various *’awāmil*.

2.55. *Al-Kaffawī*

Full name: al-Kaffawī, Abū l-Baqā’ Ayyūb b. Mūsā Ḥusaynī. Born in Kaffā, 1028/1618, died in Jerusalem, 1094/1684.⁷³

Work quoted in this study: *al-Kullīyyāt: Mu’jam fī l-muṣṭalaḥāt wal-furūq al-luġawiyya*, a dictionary explaining terms in various fields, including grammar.

⁷¹ See *IE*² III, 821–822, s.v. Ibn Qayyim al-Djawziyya; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *’Iršād* I, 11.

⁷² See *IE*² XII, 277–278, s.v. al-DJurjānī; al-Azharī, *Šarḥ*, 39–44; al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*, 28.

⁷³ See al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*, 7ff.

2.56. *Al-Kisā'ī*

Full name: al-Kisā'ī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Ḥamza b. 'Abdallāh b. Bahman b. Fayrūz. Born in Bāḥamšā, Dujayl, north of Baghdad, 119/737, died 189/805. He came to Kūfa as a boy. Al-Kisā'ī, his teacher al-Ru'āsī (see §2.65) and his pupil al-Farrā' (see §2.14), are the founders and prominent representatives of the Kūfan school.⁷⁴ As far as it is known now, none of his books has been preserved. However, in this study I quote from a book in which the editor collected al-Kisā'ī's statements in Qur'ānic commentaries (al-Kisā'ī, *Ma'ānī*). Some of the opinions attributed to him are quoted directly from primary sources, e.g. al-Farrā's *Ma'ānī*.

2.57. *Al-Makkūdī*

Full name: al-Makkūdī, Abū Zayd 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. Šāliḥ. Died in Fez, 807/1405.⁷⁵

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-Makkūdī 'alā 'alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik's *'Alfīyya* (see §2.31-a).

2.58. *Al-Mālaqī*

Full name: al-Mālaqī, Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Nūr b. Aḥmad b. Rāšid. Born in Malaga, 630/1232–1233, died 702/1302–1303.⁷⁶

Work quoted in this study: *Raṣf al-mabānī fī šarḥ ḥurūf al-ma'ānī*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.

2.59. *Al-Māzinī*

Full name: al-Māzinī, Abū 'Uṭmān Bakr b. Muḥammad. Arab philologist and Qur'ān reader from Bašra. Died between 247–249/861–863. Among his disciples, al-Mubarrad (see §2.60) is the most prominent. Nothing is preserved of al-Māzinī's works on grammar and lexicography except for *al-Taṣrīf*, a treatise on morphology, which has been transmitted in a *riwāya* 'lecture notes'; Ibn Jinnī's commentary on this work is available (see §2.30-c).⁷⁷ A number of opinions attributed to al-Māzinī are mentioned in this study.

⁷⁴ See *El*² V, 174–175, s.v. al-Kisā'ī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 127–131.

⁷⁵ See al-Makkūdī, *Šarḥ* I, 19ff.

⁷⁶ See al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*, (ط)ff.; Ḥājjī Xalifa, *Kašf* I, 908.

⁷⁷ See *El*² VI, 954b–955a, s.v. al-Māzinī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 75–76; Ḥājjī Xalifa, *Kašf* II, 1160; 1428; Howell, *Grammar* I.1, Bibliographical references, §xxi.

2.60. *Al-Mubarrad*

Full name: al-Mubarrad, Abū l-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Akbar al-Ṭumālī l-Azdī. Born in Baṣra, 210/826 (or between two and five years earlier), died 286/900 (or a year earlier). Among his pupils were al-Zajjāj (see §2.92) and Ibn al-Sarrāj (see §2.38).⁷⁸

Work quoted in this study: *al-Muqtaḍab*, a voluminous and unsystematic collection of particular questions concerning morphology and syntax.

2.61. *Al-Murādī*

Full name: al-Murādī, Ibn Umm Qāsim, Badr al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. Qāsim b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Alī. Died 749/1348. Among his teachers was Abū Ḥayyān (see §2.1).⁷⁹

Work quoted in this study: *al-Janā l-dānī fī ḥurūf al-ma‘ānī*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.

2.62. *Al-Muṭarrizī*

Full name: al-Muṭarrizī, Burhān al-Dīn Abū l-Faṭḥ (Abū l-Muẓaffar) Nāṣir b. Abī l-Makārim ‘Abd al-Sayyid b. ‘Alī l-Xwārazmī. Born in Xwārazm, 538/1144, died 610/1213.⁸⁰

Work quoted in this study: *al-Miṣbāḥ fī l-naḥw*, a concise grammar which became a text-book in the *madrasas* of the East.

2.63. *Al-Naḍr b. Šumayl*

Full name: al-Naḍr b. Šumayl b. Xaraša l-Māzinī Abū l-Ḥasan. Born in Marw al-Rūḍ, 122/740, died there, 203/818, or one year later. Among his teachers was al-Xalīl (see §2.87).⁸¹

Work quoted in this study: *Risāla fī l-ḥurūf al-‘arabiyya*, a short grammatical treatise devoted to an explanation of the Arabic letters and their usages (the relevant parts to this study are the parts devoted to *fa-*, *li-* and *wa-*).

⁷⁸ See *ET*² VII, 279–282, s.v. al-Mubarrad; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 78–80.

⁷⁹ See al-Murādī, *Janā*, 6ff.

⁸⁰ See *ET*² VII, 773b–774a, s.v. al-Muṭarrizī; al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*, 9–10.

⁸¹ See *ET*² VII, 873, s.v. al-Naḍr b. Šumayl; Sezgin, *GAS* VIII, 58–59. See also al-Naḍr b. Šumayl, *Risāla*, 159–160; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 77.

2.64. *Al-Naḥḥās*

Full name: al-Naḥḥās, Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Yūnus. Born in Egypt, date of birth unknown, died 338/950. A pupil of al-Zajjāj (see §2.92) and al-Mubarrad (see §2.60).⁸²

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *ʿIrāb al-Qurʾān*, a commentary on the Qurʾān which also contains many explanations for grammatical phenomena.
- b. *Šarḥ ʿabyāt Sibawayhi*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).

2.65. *Al-Ruʾāsī*

Full name: al-Ruʾāsī, Ibn Axī Muʿaḍ al-Harrāʾ, Muḥammad [b. al-Ḥasan] b. Abī Sāra l-Nīlī l-Naḥwī, Abū Ja'far. Lived in the second half of the second/eighth century, was a contemporary of al-Xalīl (see §2.87), with whom he maintained contacts, and the teacher of both al-Kisāʾī and al-Farrāʾ (see §2.56 and §2.14, respectively). Al-Ruʾāsī is regarded to be the founder of the Kūfan school.⁸³ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

2.66. *Al-Rummānī*

Full name: al-Rummānī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbdallāh. Born in Baghdad, 296/909, died 384/994. Studied under Ibn al-Sarrāj (see §2.38), al-Zajjāj (see §2.92) and others.⁸⁴

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Ḥudūd fī l-naḥw*, a book which defines grammatical terms.⁸⁵
- b. *Maʿānī l-ḥurūf*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.
- c. *Manāzil al-ḥurūf*, a concise grammatical treatise devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.⁸⁵ It constitutes, with some slight variation, the final 23 *ʿabwāb* of his *Maʿānī l-ḥurūf* (see b. above).

⁸² See *ET*² III, 898b–899a, s.v. Ibn al-Naḥḥās (where he is erroneously referred to as Ibn al-Naḥḥās instead of al-Naḥḥās); Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 207–209; al-Naḥḥās, *Šarḥ*, gff.

⁸³ See *ET*² VIII, 573, s.v. al-Ruʾāsī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 125–126.

⁸⁴ See *ET*² VIII, 614–615, s.v. al-Rummānī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 111–113.

⁸⁵ I also used *Risālatani fī l-luġa*, which contains both *al-Ḥudūd fī l-naḥw* and *Manāzil al-ḥurūf*.

- d. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, a book which contains parts of al-Rummānī's commentary on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).

2.67. *Al-Šāḡānī*

Full name: al-Šāḡānī, Raḡī l-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Ḥaydar b. 'Alī b. Ismā'īl al-Qurašī l-'Adawī l-'Umarī. Born 577/1181, died 650/1252.⁸⁶

Work quoted in this study: *al-Takmila wal-ḡayl wal-šila likitāb Tāj al-luḡa waṣaḡāḡ al-'arabiyya*, a supplement to al-Jawharī's *Tāj* (see §2.52), which comprises linguistic usages overlooked by al-Jawharī and extensive corrections of his errors.

2.68. *Al-Šāḡib Ibn 'Abbād*

Full name: al-Šāḡib Ibn 'Abbād, Kāfī l-kufāt, Abū l-Qāsim Ismā'īl b. 'Abbād b. al-'Abbās b. 'Abbād b. Aḡmad b. Idrīs. Born in Iṣṡaxr, 326/938, (but the sources disagree on his date and place of birth), died 385/995.⁸⁷

Work quoted in this study: *al-Muḡiṡ fī l-luḡa*, a dictionary with rather short definitions.

2.69. *Šalāḡ al-Dīn*

Full name: Šalāḡ al-Dīn b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Abī l-Qāsim. Date of birth unknown, died 849/1445–1446.⁸⁸

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḡ kāfīyat Ibn al-Ḥāḡib*, a commentary on Ibn al-Ḥāḡib's *Kāfīya* (see §2.28-c).

2.70. *Al-Šalawbīn*

Full name: al-Šalawbīn, Abū 'Alī 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'Abdallāḡ al-Azdī l-Išbīlī l-Naḡwī. Andalusian grammarian, born 562/1166, died 645/1247.⁸⁹ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

⁸⁶ See *El*² VIII, 820–821, s.v. al-Šaḡḡānī; Ḥāḡḡī Xalifa, *Kašf* II, 1072.

⁸⁷ See *El*² III, 671–673, s.v. Ibn 'Abbād; Sezḡin, *GAS* VIII, 206–208. See also Nāḡī, *al-'Aḡjār*, 1–5, where the author examines another work of al-Šāḡib Ibn 'Abbād. According to Ḥāḡḡī Xalifa, *Kašf* I, 383, he died in 562/1166–1167, but this data contradicts other sources.

⁸⁸ See Šalāḡ al-Dīn, *Šarḡ* I, 45.

⁸⁹ See *El*² IX, 257–258, s.v. al-Šalawbīn; Ḥāḡḡī Xalifa, *Kašf* I, 508; II, 1800.

2.71. *Al-Šanʿānī*

Full name: al-Šanʿānī, Sābiq al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Aḥmad b. Yaʿīš. Date of birth unknown, died (probably) 680/1281, but in any case before 709/1309–1310.⁹⁰

Work quoted in this study: *al-Taḥdīb al-wasīṭ fī l-naḥw*, a grammar divided to *Kitāb al-ʿuṣūl* and *Kitāb al-furūʿ*.

2.72. *Al-Šantamarī*

Full name: al-Šantamarī, Abū l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Sulaymān al-Andalusī l-Naḥwī. Born in Šantamariyyat al-ġarb (modern Faro, on the southern coast of Portugal), 410/1019, died in Seville, 476/1083.⁹¹

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Nukat fī tafsīr kitāb Sibawayhi*, a commentary on a number of issues from Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).
- b. *Taḥṣīl ʿayn al-dahab min maʿdīn jawhar al-ʿadab fī ʿilm majāzāt al-ʿarab*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*, mentioned in a. above.⁹²

2.73. *Al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī*

Full name: al-Jurjānī, al-Sayyid al-Šarīf, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī. Born in Tājū near Astarābād, 740/1339, died in Šīrāz, 816/1413.⁹³

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Šarḥ ʿabyāt al-mufaṣṣal wal-mutawassīṭ*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal* (see §2.94-b).
- b. *Al-Taʾrīfāt*, a book with various short definitions.

2.74. *Al-Šarīf al-Kūfī*

Full name: al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, Jamāl al-Šaraf Abū l-Barakāt al-ʿAlawī l-Zaydī, ʿUmar b. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad. Born in Kūfa, 442/1050–1051, died there, 539/1145.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ See al-Šanʿānī, *Taḥdīb*, 7–8.

⁹¹ See *ET*² IX, 306, s.v. al-Šantamarī.

⁹² I used the 1992 edition (al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1992)) and the Būlāq edition (al-Šantamarī, *Taḥṣīl* (1898)) where al-Šantamarī's commentary is on the bottom of the text of Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*.

⁹³ See *ET*² II, 602–603, s.v. al-Djurdjānī, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad.

⁹⁴ See *ET*² XII, 19, s.v. Abū l-Barakāt al-ʿAlawī al-Zaydī; al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*, 9–25.

Work quoted in this study: *al-Bayān fī šarḥ al-lumaʿ l Ibn Jinnī*, a commentary on Ibn Jinnī's *Lumaʿ* (see §2.30-a).

2.75. *Al-Saxāwī*

Full name: al-Saxāwī, ʿAlam al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Šamad b. ʿAbd al-Aḥad b. ʿAbd al-Ġalīb b. ʿUṭās al-Hamadānī l-Miṣrī. Born in Saxā (Egypt), probably 558/1162–1163, died 643/1245–1246.⁹⁵

Work quoted in this study: *al-Mufaḍḍal fī šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal (bāb al-ḥurūf)*, a commentary on the part devoted to particles in al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal* (see §2.94-b).

2.76. *Al-Šaymarī*

Full name: al-Šaymarī, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAlī b. Iṣḥāq. A grammarian who died in the fourth or sixth century AH⁹⁶ and wrote *al-Tabṣira wal-taḍkira*.⁹⁷ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

2.77. *Sibawayhi*

Full name: Sibawayhi, Abū Bišr ʿAmr b. ʿUṭmān. Died ca. 180/796. His most important teacher is al-Xalīl (see §2.87); he quotes six other teachers as well: ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Iṣḥāq, ʿĪsā b. ʿUmar (see §2.49), Abū ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlāʾ, Hārūn al-Qārī, Abū l-Xaṭṭāb al-Axfaš and Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (see §2.90).⁹⁸

His *Kitāb* is the most important source in this study. It has several commentaries, five of which were used in this study: Abū Saʿīd al-Sīrāfi's, al-Fārisi's, al-Rummānī's, al-Šantamarī's and Ibn Xarūf's. I also used al-Naḥḥās', Abū Muḥammad al-Sīrāfi's and al-Šantamarī's commentaries on the poetry quoted in the *Kitāb*. See also preface, §2.1.1.1.

⁹⁵ See al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*, 10–11.

⁹⁶ See al-Šaymarī, *Tabṣira*, 5–18, where the editor quotes Brockelmann's statement that this grammarian died 541/1146–1147, rejects it and contends that he died in the fourth century AH.

⁹⁷ According to Ḥājjī Xalīfa, *Kašf* I, 339, the book's title is *al-Tabṣira fī l-naḥw*.

⁹⁸ See *ET*² IX, 524–531, s.v. Sibawayhi; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 51–63; Levin, *Sibawayhi*; Levin, *Dialectology*.

2.78. *Al-Sirāfi, Abū Muḥammad*

Full name: al-Sirāfi, Abū Muḥammad Yūsuf b. al-Ḥasan. Died in Baghdad, 385/995, aged 55 years. The son of Abū Saʿīd al-Sirāfi (see §2.79), the famous commentator of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).⁹⁹

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ 'abyāt Sībawayhi*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in the above-mentioned Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.

2.79. *Al-Sirāfi, Abū Saʿīd*

Full name: al-Sirāfi, Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbdallāh b. al-Marzubān. Born in Sirāf between 279–289/892–902, died in Baghdad, 368/979.¹⁰⁰

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ kitāb Sībawayhi*, a commentary on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77).¹⁰¹

2.80. *Al-Širbīnī*

Full name: al-Širbīnī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. Died 977/1570.¹⁰²

Work quoted in this study: *Nūr al-sajīyya fī ḥall 'alfāz al-'ajurrūmiyya*, a commentary on Ibn Ājurrūm's *'Ājurrūmiyya* (mentioned in §2.12; see note 18).

2.81. *Al-Suhaylī*

Full name: al-Suhaylī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbdallāh Abū l-Qāsim. Born in Suhayl (modern Fuengirola), 508/1114, died in Morocco, 581/1185.¹⁰³

Work quoted in this study: *Natā'ij al-fikr fī l-naḥw*, a grammar which often contains original ideas and views.

2.82. *Al-Suyūṭī*

Full name: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. Born in Cairo, 849/1445, died in Rawḍa, 911/1505.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ See *EL*² IX, 669b, s.v. al-Sirāfi, Abū Muḥammad Yūsuf; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 113. Whenever I refer to this grammarian in this study, I use “Abū Muḥammad al-Sirāfi”, whereas his father, the famous Abū Saʿīd al-Sirāfi, is referred to as “al-Sirāfi”.

¹⁰⁰ See *EL*² IX, 668–669, s.v. al-Sirāfi, Abū Saʿīd; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 98–101. Cf. note 99.

¹⁰¹ To examine al-Sirāfi's statements I used the 1986 onwards incomplete edition (al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Cairo)*), the excerpts in the margins of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (al-Sirāfi, *Šarḥ (Bulāq)*) and the excerpts quoted by Jahn (Jahn, *Translation*).

¹⁰² See al-Širbīnī, *Nūr*, 467, note 8.

¹⁰³ See *EL*² XII, 756a, s.v. al-Suhaylī; al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*, 20–22.

¹⁰⁴ See *EL*² IX, 913–916, s.v. al-Suyūṭī.

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *ʿAlfiyyat al-Suyūṭī l-naḥwīyya*, a treatise on grammar in about one thousand verses (in the *raǧaz* meter).
- b. *Al-ʿAšbāh wal-naẓāʾir fī l-naḥw*, a treatise devoted to similar and different phenomena in Arabic grammar.¹⁰⁵
- c. *Hamʿ al-hawāmiʿ fī šarḥ jamʿ al-jawāmiʿ*, a comprehensive grammar in which many early writings, which are no longer accessible, are quoted.¹⁰⁶
- d. *Al-ʾItqān fī ʾulūm al-Qurʾān*, a commentary on the Qurʾān which also contains many explanations for grammatical phenomena.¹⁰⁷
- e. *Šarḥ matn al-ʿalfiyya fī l-naḥw wal-šarf*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik’s *ʿAlfiyya* (see §2.31-a).
- f. *Šarḥ šawāhid al-muǧnī*, a commentary on the poetry quoted in Ibn Hišām’s *Muǧnī l-labīb* (see §2.29-d).¹⁰⁸

2.83. *Taʿlab*

Full name: Taʿlab, Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Zayd b. Sayyār Šaybānī. Famous grammarian and philologist of the Kūfan school. Born in Baghdad, 200/815–816, died in a road accident, 291/904.¹⁰⁹

Work quoted in this study: *Majālis Taʿlab*, a collection of reports on philological discussions.¹¹⁰

2.84. *Al-ʿUkbarī*

Full name: al-ʿUkbarī, ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn, Abū l-Baqāʾ, Muḥibb al-Dīn. Philologist and *faqīh* of Baghdad. Born ca. 538/1143, died ca. 616/1219.¹¹¹

Works quoted in this study:

¹⁰⁵ I used mainly the 1985–1998 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *ʿAšbāh* (1998)), and also, to some extent, the 1975 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *ʿAšbāh* (1975)) and the 1940–1942 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *ʿAšbāh* (1942)).

¹⁰⁶ I also used the modern commentary of al-Šinqīṭī (al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar*).

¹⁰⁷ I used mainly the 1900–1901 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1901)), and also, to some extent, the 1857 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *ʾItqān* (1857)).

¹⁰⁸ I used the 1904 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1904)) and the 1966 edition (al-Suyūṭī, *Šarḥ šawāhid* (1966)), which is more comfortable to use.

¹⁰⁹ See *EI*² X, 433, s.v. *Taʿlab*; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 140–142.

¹¹⁰ Unfortunately, I was able to use only the first of the two-volumes edition.

¹¹¹ See *EI*² X, 790–791, s.v. al-ʿUkbarī; al-ʿUkbarī, *Lubāb*, gff.

- a. *Al-Lubāb fī 'ilal al-binā' wal-'i'rāb*, a grammatical treatise dealing with morphology and syntax.
- b. *Al-Mašūf al-mu'lam fī tartīb al-'iṣlāḥ 'alā ḥurūf al-mu'jam*, an alphabetical order classification of Ibn al-Sikkīt's glossary of *'iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq*.
- c. *Al-Tibyān fī 'i'rāb al-Qur'ān*, a book devoted to grammatical analysis of Qur'ānic verses.

2.85. *Al-Uṣmūnī*

Full name: al-Uṣmūnī, Abū l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Īsā. Born in Cairo, 838/1435, died ca. 900/1495.¹¹²

Work quoted in this study: *Šarḥ al-Uṣmūnī 'alā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, a commentary on Ibn Mālik's *'Alfiyya* (see §2.31-a).

2.86. *Al-Warrāq*

Full name: al-Warrāq, Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. al-'Abbās al-Baġdādī. A grammarian from Baghdad. Died 381/991.¹¹³

Work quoted in this study: *al-'Ilal fī l-naḥw*, a rather concise grammar.

2.87. *Al-Xalīl*

Full name: al-Xalīl b. Aḥmad b. 'Amr b. Tamīm al-Farāhīdī l-Azdī l-Yaḥmadī l-Baṣrī Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān. Sibawayhi's most important teacher (see §2.77). Born in 'Umān, grew up in Baṣra where he died, at over seventy, 175/791, or 170/786, or 160/776.¹¹⁴

Work quoted in this study: *Kitāb al-'ayn*, the first Arabic dictionary available to us, which his contemporary al-Layṭ b. al-Muzaḥḥar completed, edited and published.

2.88. *Al-Xwārazmī, Abū 'Abdallāh*

Full name: al-Xwārazmī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Kātib. Died ca. 380/990–991.¹¹⁵

Work quoted in this study: *Maḡātīḥ al-'ulūm*, an introduction (*madḡal*) to the elements of the sciences (*'awā'il al-ṣinā'āt*), including grammar.

¹¹² See al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ* I, 8–9.

¹¹³ See Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 172–173; al-Warrāq, *'Ilal*, 9–15.

¹¹⁴ See *El*² IV, 962–964, s.v. al-KḤalīl b. Aḥmad; Sezgin, *GAS* VIII, 51–56; IX, 44–48.

¹¹⁵ See *El*² IV, 1068–1069, s.v. al-KḤwārazmī, Abū 'Abd Allāh; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 237.

2.89. *Al-Xwārazmī, Ṣadr al-Afāḍil*

Full name: al-Xwārazmī, Ṣadr al-Afāḍil al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥusayn. Born 555/1160, died 617/1220. Among his teachers were al-Muṭarrizī (see §2.62) and Faxr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the famous Qurʾān commentator (died 606/1209).¹¹⁶

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Ṣarḥ al-mufaṣṣal fī šunʿat al-ʿirāb*, a commentary on al-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal* (see §2.94-b).
- b. *Taršīḥ al-ʿilal fī šarḥ al-jumal*, a commentary on al-Jurjānī's *Jumal* (see §2.54-a).

2.90. *Yūnus b. Ḥabīb*

Full name: Yūnus b. Ḥabīb Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. Prominent Baṣran grammarian and philologist. Born ca. 90/708, died ca. 182 or 183/798 or 799. One of Sibawayhi's main teachers (see §2.77).¹¹⁷ A number of opinions attributed to him are mentioned in this study.

2.91. *Al-Zabīdī*

Full name: al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī l-Ḥanafī. Born in Bilgrām (in Kanawj, north-western India), 1145/1732, died in Cairo, 1205/1791.¹¹⁸

Work quoted in this study: *Tāj al-ʿarūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs*, a commentary on al-Fīrūzābādī's *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ* (see §2.16).¹¹⁹

2.92. *Al-Zajjāj*

Full name: al-Zajjāj, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. al-Sarī. Born in Baghdad, ca. 230/844, died there, 311/923. The main teacher of al-Zajjājī (see §2.93), al-Fārisī (see §2.13) and al-Rummānī (see §2.66). He himself had learnt grammar from both Taʿlab (see §2.83) and al-Mubarrad (see §2.60).¹²⁰

Works quoted in this study: two commentaries on the Qurʾān, which also contain many explanations for grammatical phenomena:

¹¹⁶ See al-Xwārazmī, *Ṣarḥ al-mufaṣṣal* I, 11ff.; al-Xwārazmī, *Ṣarḥ al-jumal*, 15–28.

¹¹⁷ See *El*² XI, 348b, s.v. Yūnus b. Ḥabīb; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 49–51.

¹¹⁸ See *El*² VII, 445, s.v. Muḥammad Murtaḍā.

¹¹⁹ I used mainly the 1994 edition (al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1994)), and compared it to the 1888–1889 edition (al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1889)).

¹²⁰ See *El*² XI, 377–378, s.v. al-Zajjāj; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 81–82.

- a. *ʿIrāb al-Qurʿān*.
- b. *Maʿānī l-Qurʿān*.¹²¹

2.93. *Al-Zajjājī*

Full name: al-Zajjājī, Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq. Born in Nihāwand (western Persia) ca. 245–257/860–870, died (probably) in Tiberias, either 337/948 or 339–340/949–950. His main teacher was al-Zajjāj (see §2.92), from whom he received his *nisba* because of his long association with him.¹²²

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Hurūf al-maʿānī*, devoted to grammatical explanations of particles.
- b. *Al-Jumal fī l-naḥw* ‘the book of summaries in grammar’, a didactic introduction to Arabic grammar. *Al-Jumal* became one of the most popular textbooks in the Arab world, especially in North Africa, where at one time more than 120 commentaries were current. Four commentaries were used in this study: al-Baṭalyawsī’s, Ibn ʿUṣfūr’s, Ibn Abī Rabī’s and Ibn Hišām’s, as well as al-Baṭalyawsī’s commentary on the poetry quoted in this book.
- c. *Al-Lāmāt*, a treatise on particles containing a *lām*.
- d. *Majālīs al-ʿulamāʾ*, a collection of notes and comments, which is one of the most important sources on debates between grammarians.

2.94. *Al-Zamaxšarī*

Full name: al-Zamaxšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar. One of the outstanding scholars of later mediaeval Islamic times. Born in Zamaxšar in Xwārazm, 467/1075, died in Jurjāniyya in Xwārazm, 538/1144.¹²³

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-ʿAḥājī l-naḥwiyya*, a work on grammatical controversies.
- b. *Al-Mufaṣṣal fī šunʿat al-ʿirāb*, a compendium on Arabic grammar. *Al-Mufaṣṣal* has several commentaries, four of which were used in this study: al-Xwārazmī’s, Ibn Yaʿīš’s, al-Saxāwī’s and Ibn al-Ḥājjib’s, as well as al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī’s commentary on the poetry quoted in this book.

¹²¹ I used mainly the 1994 edition (al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1994)), but since it contains no indices and thus hard to use, I also used the 1973 edition (al-Zajjāj, *Maʿānī* (1973)).

¹²² See *El*² XI, 378–379, s.v. al-Zaḍḍjādī; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 88–95.

¹²³ See *El*² XI, 431–434, s.v. al-Zamakḥsharī.

- c. *Muqaddimat al-'adab*, a bilingual Arabic-Persian dictionary.
- d. *Šarḥ al-faṣīḥ*, a commentary on Ta'lab's *Faṣīḥ* (see §2.83).
- e. *Al-'Unmūdaj fī l-naḥw*, an excerpt from his *al-Mufaṣṣal* (see b. above).
I used al-Ardabīlī's commentary on this book (see §2.2).

2.95. *Al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī*

Full name: al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Abdallāh b. Maḍḥij. Born in Seville, ca. 316/928, died there, 379/989.¹²⁴

Works quoted in this study:

- a. *Al-Istidrāk 'alā Sībawayhi fī Kitāb al-'abniya wal-ziyādāt 'alā mā 'awradahu fīhi muḥaddaban*, additions and corrections to Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* (see §2.77), focusing on the structure of nouns, etc.
- b. *Al-Wāḍiḥ fī 'ilm al-'arabiyya*, a highly-praised, clearly-arranged grammar, composed after the example of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* mentioned above, but shorter than others.

3. CHRONOLOGICAL KEY

Below is a chronological key of all the grammarians and lexicographers mentioned in §2 above, sorted according to their Hijrī year of death. Grammarians whose works I do not quote, but only mention opinions attributed to them, are marked with an asterisk.

Section number	Name	Hijrī year of death
2.49.	* 'Īsā b. 'Umar	149
2.87.	Al-Xalīl	175, 170 or 160
2.77.	Sībawayhi	ca. 180
2.90.	* Yūnus b. Ḥabīb	182 or 183
2.56.	* Al-Kisā'ī	189
2.65.	* Al-Ru'āsī	second century AH
2.63.	Al-Naḍr b. Šumayl	203 or 204
2.14.	Al-Farrā'	207
2.20.	* Hišām b. Mu'āwiya	209
2.4.	Al-Axfaš	between 210–221
2.51.	* Al-Jarmī	225

¹²⁴ See *ET*² XI, 548–549, s.v. al-Zubaydī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan; Sezgin, *GAS* IX, 222–223; al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī, *Wāḍiḥ*, 7ff.

(cont.)

Section number	Name	Hijrī year of death
2.59.	* Al-Māzinī	between 247–249
2.35.	Ibn Qutayba	276
2.60.	Al-Mubarrad	286 or 285
2.83.	Ta'lab	291
2.92.	Al-Zajjāj	311
2.38.	Ibn al-Sarrāj	316
2.40.	Ibn Šuqayr	317 or 315
2.93.	Al-Zajjājī	between 337–340
2.64.	Al-Naḥḥās	338
2.79.	Al-Sīrāfi, Abū Sa'īd	368
2.7.	Al-Azharī (lexicographer)	370
2.13.	Al-Fārisī	377
2.95.	Al-Zubaydī l-Išbīlī	379
2.88.	Al-Xwārazmī, Abū 'Abdallāh	ca. 380
2.86.	Al-Warrāq	381
2.66.	Al-Rummānī	384
2.68.	Al-Šāḥib Ibn 'Abbād	385
2.78.	Al-Sīrāfi, Abū Muḥammad	385
2.30.	Ibn Jinnī	392
2.52.	Al-Jawharī	between 393–400
2.27.	Ibn Fāris	395
2.17.	Al-Harawī	ca. 410
2.11.	Al-Ḍarīr	ca. 430
2.26.	Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī	456
2.39.	Ibn Sīda	458
2.24.	* Ibn Bābašād	469
2.54.	Al-Jurjānī	471
2.72.	Al-Šantamarī	476
2.18.	Al-Ḥarīrī	516
2.9.	Al-Baṭalyawsī	521
2.41.	Ibn al-Ṭarāwa	528
2.94.	Al-Zamaxšarī	538
2.74.	Al-Šarīf al-Kūfi	539
2.76.	* Al-Šaymarī	541 or fourth century AH
2.37.	Ibn al-Šajarī	542
2.46.	Ibn al-Xaššāb	567
2.19.	Al-Ḥimyarī	ca. 573
2.22.	Ibn al-Anbārī	577
2.81.	Al-Suhaylī	581
2.25.	Ibn Barrī	582
2.36.	Ibn Rušd	595
2.45.	Ibn Xarūf	between 606–610
2.62.	Al-Muṭarrizī	610

(cont.)

Section number	Name	Hijrī year of death
2.84.	Al-ʿUkbarī	ca. 616
2.89.	Al-Xwārazmī, Ṣadr al-Afāḍil	617
2.33.	Ibn Muʿṭī	628
2.48.	Al-Irbilī	631 (or later)
2.44.	Ibn al-Xabbāz	637 or 639
2.47.	Ibn Yaʿīš	643
2.75.	Al-Saxāwī	643
2.70.	* Al-Šalawbīn	645
2.28.	Ibn al-Ḥājib	646
2.67.	Al-Šāḡānī	650
2.42.	Ibn ʿUṣfūr	670
2.31.	Ibn Mālīk	672
2.3.	Al-Astarābāḍī	684 or 686
2.34.	Ibn al-Nāẓim	686
2.21.	Ibn Abī Rabīʿ	688
2.58.	Al-Mālaqī	702
2.71.	Al-Šanʿānī	before 709
2.32.	Ibn Manẓūr	711
2.1.	Abū Ḥayyān	745
2.43.	Ibn al-Wardī	749
2.61.	Al-Murādī	749
2.53.	Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya	751
2.29.	Ibn Hišām	761
2.23.	Ibn ʿAqīl	769
2.15.	Al-Fayyūmī	after 770
2.57.	Al-Makkūdī	807
2.73.	Al-Šarīf al-Jurġānī	816
2.16.	Al-Firūzābādī	817
2.69.	Šalāḥ al-Dīn	849
2.5.	Al-ʿAynī	855
2.50.	Al-Jāmī	898
2.85.	Al-Ušmūnī	ca. 900
2.6.	Al-Azharī (later grammarian)	905
2.82.	Al-Suyūṭī	911
2.12.	Al-Fākiḥī	972
2.80.	Al-Širbīnī	977
2.2.	Al-Ardabilī	1036
2.8.	Al-Baḡdādī	1093
2.55.	Al-Kaffawī	1094
2.91.	Al-Zabīdī	1205
2.10.	Al-Bustānī	1300

BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Abū Ḥayyān, *Irtiṣāf*: Abū Ḥayyān, Aṭīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ġarnāṭī. *Irtiṣāf al-ḍarab min lisān al-‘arab*. Eds. Rajab ‘Uṭmān Muḥammad and Ramaḍān ‘Abd al-Tawwāb. Cairo: Maktabat al-Xānjī, 1418/1998. 5 vols.
- , *Manhaj*: Abū Ḥayyān, Aṭīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ġarnāṭī. *Manhaj as-sālik: Abū Ḥayyān’s commentary to the alfiyya of Ibn Mālik*. Ed. Sidney Glazer. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1947.
- , *Tadrib*: Abū Ḥayyān, Aṭīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ġarnāṭī. *Al-Tadrib fī tamṭil al-taqrib*. Ed. Nihād Fulayḥ Ḥasan. Baghdad: Maṭba‘at al-Irṣād, [1987].
- , *Taḍyil*: Abū Ḥayyān, Aṭīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ġarnāṭī. *Al-Taḍyil wal-takmil fī šarḥ kitāb al-tashīl*. Ed. Ḥasan Hindāwī. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1997–2000. 4 vols (incomplete).
- , *Taqrib*: Abū Ḥayyān, Aṭīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Ġarnāṭī. *Taqrib al-muqarrib*. Ed. ‘Afīf ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. Beirut: Dār al-Masīra, 1402/1982.
- al-Ardabīlī, *Šarḥ*: al-Ardabīlī, Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Šams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ġanī. “*Kitāb al-‘Unmūdaj [sic] fī l-naḥw, ta’līf al-Imām al-‘Allāma Jār Allāh Abī l-Qāsīm Maḥmūd b. ‘Umar al-Zamaxšarī, waqad šaraḥahu Jamāl al-Milla wal-Dīn Muḥammad b. Šams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ġanī l-Ardabīlī*”. In: de Sacy, M. Le Baron Silvestre (ed.). *Anthologie grammaticale arabe*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1829. pp. 99–118.
- al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1979): al-Astarābādī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. “*Šarḥ al-kāfiya*”. In: Ibn al-Ḥājj, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr ‘Uṭmān b. ‘Umar b. Abī Bakr al-Mālikī. *Al-Kāfiya fī l-naḥw*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1399/1979. 2 vols.
- , *Šarḥ al-kāfiya* (1998): al-Astarābādī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājj*. Ed. Imīl Badī Ya‘qūb. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1419/1998. 5 vols.
- , *Šarḥ al-šāfiya*: al-Astarābādī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. *Šarḥ šāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājj*. Eds. Muḥammad Nūr al-Ḥasan et al. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1402/1982. 2 vols.
- al-Axfaš, *Ma‘ānī* (1981): al-Axfaš al-Awsaṭ, Abū l-Ḥasan Sa‘īd b. Mas‘ada. *Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān*. Ed. Fā‘iz Fāris. Kuwait: Dār al-Bašīr, 1401/1981. 2 vols.
- , *Ma‘ānī* (1985): al-Axfaš al-Awsaṭ, Abū l-Ḥasan Sa‘īd b. Mas‘ada. *Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Amīr Muḥammad Amīn al-Ward. Beirut: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1405/1985. 2 vols.
- , *Ma‘ānī* (1990): al-Axfaš al-Awsaṭ, Abū l-Ḥasan Sa‘īd b. Mas‘ada. *Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān*. Ed. Hudā Maḥmūd Qarā‘a. Cairo: Maktabat al-Xānjī, 1411/1990. 2 vols.
- al-‘Aynī, *Maqāšid*: al-‘Aynī, Abū Muḥammad Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad b. Mūsā Badr al-Dīn. *Al-Maqāšid al-naḥwiyya fī šarḥ šawāhid šurūḥ al-‘alfiyya*. In the margins of al-Baġdādī, ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Umar, *Xizānat al-‘adab walubb lubāb lisān al-‘arab ‘alā šawāhid šarḥ al-kāfiya, biḥāmišihī kitāb al-maqāšid al-naḥwiyya fī šarḥ šawāhid al-‘alfiyya*. Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a l-Miriyya, 1299/1881. 4 vols.
- al-Azharī, *Muwaššil*: al-Azharī, Xālid b. ‘Abdallāh b. Abī Bakr. *Muwaššil al-tullāb ‘ilā qawā‘id al-‘irāb*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Karīm Mujāhid. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1417/1996.

¹ Works consulted using the digital collections *Maktabat al-naḥw wal-šarf*, *Maktabat al-ma‘ājim* and *Maktabat al-fiqh wa’uṣūlihi* by al-Turāṭ are marked with an asterisk. These collections allow browsing the electronic editions of some grammars, lexicons, commentaries on the Qur‘ān and bibliographic works, and conducting a content search.

- , *Šarḥ*: al-Azhari, Xalid b. ‘Abdallāh b. Abī Bakr. *Al-‘Awāmil al-mi’a l-naḥwīyya fi ‘uṣūl ‘ilm al-‘arabiyya: Šarḥ Xalid al-Azhari l-Jirjāwī*. Ed. al-Badrāwī Zahrān. Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, [1988].
- , *Taṣriḥ*: al-Azhari, Xalid b. ‘Abdallāh b. Abī Bakr. *Al-Taṣriḥ bimaḍmūn al-tawḍiḥ fi l-naḥw*. Ed. Muḥammad Bāsīl ‘Uyūn al-Sūd. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, n.d. 3 vols.
- al-Azhari, *Tahḍīb*: al-Azhari, Abū Maṣṣūr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Azhar. *Tahḍīb al-luḡa*. Eds. ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn et al. Cairo: al-Dār al-Miṣriyya lil-Ta’līf wal-Tarjama and Dār al-Kātib al-‘Arabī, 1964–1967. 15 vols; Hārūn, ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad, *Fahāris mu’jam tahḍīb al-luḡa lil-Azhari*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Xānjī, 1976.
- al-Baḡdādī, *Šarḥ*: al-Baḡdādī, ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Umar. *Šarḥ šawāhid šarḥ al-tuḥfa l-wardiyya*. Ed. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Alī l-Šallāl. Riad: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, 1421/2001. 2 vols.
- , *Xizāna* (1979): al-Baḡdādī, ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Umar. *Xizānat al-‘adab walubb lubāb lisān al-‘arab ‘alā šawāhid šarḥ al-kāfiyya*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Cairo: al-Hay’a l-Miṣriyya l-‘Āmma lil-Kitāb, 1979. 13 vols.
- al-Baṭalyawṣī, *‘Iṣlāḥ*: al-Baṭalyawṣī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Sīd. *‘Iṣlāḥ al-xalal al-waqi’ fi l-jumal lil-Zajjāji*. Ed. Ḥamza ‘Abdallāh al-Naṣratī. Riad: Dār al-Mirrix, 1399/1979.
- , *Šarḥ*: al-Baṭalyawṣī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Sīd. *Al-Ḥulal fi šarḥ ‘abyāt al-jumal*. Ed. Muṣṭafā Imām. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Dār al-Miṣriyya, 1979.
- al-Bustānī, *Muḥiṭ*: al-Bustānī, Buṭrus b. Būlus. *Muḥiṭ al-muḥiṭ: Qāmūs muṭawwal lil-luḡa l-‘arabiyya*. Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān, 1870. 2 vols.
- al-Ḍarir, *Šarḥ*: al-Ḍarir al-Wasiṭī, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Mubāšir Abū Naṣr. *Šarḥ al-luma’ fi l-naḥw*. Eds. Rajab ‘Uṭmān Muḥammad and Ramaḍān ‘Abd al-Tawwāb. Cairo: Maktabat al-Xānjī, 1420/2000.
- al-Fākihī, *Šarḥ*: al-Fākihī, ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad Abū ‘Alī Jamāl al-Dīn. *Šarḥ al-fawākih al-janiyya ‘alā mutammimat al-‘ajurrūmiyya*. Ed. Maḥmūd Naṣṣār. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1425/2004.
- al-Fārisī, *Baḡdādiyyāt*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Al-Masā’il al-muškila l-ma’rūfa bil-baḡdādiyyāt*. Ed. Šalāḥ al-Dīn ‘Abdallāh al-Singāwī. Baghdad: Maṭba‘at al-‘Ānī, [1983].
- , *Baṣriyyāt*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Al-Masā’il al-baṣriyyāt*. Ed. Muḥammad al-Šāṭir Aḥmad Muḥammad Aḥmad. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Madanī, 1405/1985. 2 vols.
- , *Ḥalabiyyāt*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Al-Masā’il al-ḥalabiyyāt*. Ed. Ḥasan Hindāwī. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1407/1987.
- , *‘Idāḥ*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *“Al-‘Idāḥ”*. In: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. *Al-Muqtaṣid fi šarḥ al-‘idāḥ*. Ed. Kāzim Baḥr al-Marjān. Baghdad: Dār al-Raṣīd, 1982. 2 vols.
- , *‘Iḡfāl*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Al-‘Iḡfāl*. Ed. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar al-Ḥājj Ibrāhīm. Abu Dhabi: al-Majma‘ al-Ṭaqāfi, 1434/2003. 2 vols.
- , *Manṭūra*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Al-Masā’il al-manṭūra*. Ed. Muṣṭafā l-Ḥudari. Damascus: Majma‘ al-Luḡa l-‘Arabiyya, 1406/1986.
- , *Šarḥ al-‘abyāt*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Kitāb al-šir’ aw Šarḥ al-‘abyāt al-muškilat al-‘irāb*. Ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī. Cairo: Maktabat al-Madanī, 1408/1988. 2 vols.
- , *Ta’līqa*: al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī l-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ġaffār. *Al-Ta’līqa ‘alā kitāb Sibawayhi*. Ed. ‘Awaḍ b. Ḥamad al-Qūzī. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Amāna, 1990–1996. 6 vols.
- al-Farrā’, *Ma’āni*: al-Farrā’, Abū Zakariyyā’ Yahyā b. Ziyād. *Ma’āni l-Qur’ān*. Vol I eds. Aḥmad Yūsuf Najātī and Muḥammad ‘Alī l-Najjār. Cairo: al-Hay’a l-Miṣriyya l-‘Āmma lil-Kitāb, 1374/1955; Vol II ed. Muḥammad ‘Alī l-Najjār. Cairo: al-Dār al-Miṣriyya lil-Ta’līf wal-Tarjama, n.d.; Vol III ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Ismā’il Šalabī. Cairo: al-Hay’a l-Miṣriyya l-‘Āmma lil-Kitāb, 1972.

- al-Fayyūmī, *Miṣbāḥ*: * al-Fayyūmī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī l-Muqri'. *Al-Miṣbāḥ al-munir fi ḡarīb al-ṣarḥ al-kabir lil-Rāfi'*. Beirut: al-Maktaba l-'Ilmiyya, n.d. 2 vols.
- al-Firūzābādī, *Qāmūs* (1913): al-Firūzābādī, Abū l-Ṭāhir Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Majd al-Dīn al-Šāfi'ī l-Širāzī. *Al-Qāmūs al-muḥiṭ*. Ed. Muṣṭafā Majd al-Dīn al-'Anānī. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1332/1913. 4 vols.
- , *Qāmūs* (1987): al-Firūzābādī, Abū l-Ṭāhir Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Majd al-Dīn al-Šāfi'ī l-Širāzī. *Al-Qāmūs al-muḥiṭ*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1407/1987.
- al-Harawī, *'Azhiya*: al-Harawī, 'Alī b. Muḥammad Abū l-Ḥasan. *Al-'Azhiya fi 'ilm al-ḥurūf*. Ed. 'Abd al-Mu'īn al-Mallūhī. Damascus: Majma' al-Luġa l-'Arabiyya, 1401/1981.
- al-Ḥarīrī, *Durra*: al-Ḥarīrī, Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Utmān b. al-Ḥarīrī l-Baṣrī. *Durrat al-ġawwāṣ fi 'awḥām al-xawāss*. Ed. Heinrich Thorbecke. Leipzig: Vogel, 1871.
- , *Šarḥ*: al-Ḥarīrī, Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Utmān b. al-Ḥarīrī l-Baṣrī. *Šarḥ mulḥat al-'irāb*. Ed. Barakāt Yūsuf Habbūd. Beirut: al-Maktaba l-'Aṣriyya, 1997.
- al-Ḥimyarī, *Šams* (1951): al-Ḥimyarī, Naṣwān b. Sa'īd b. Naṣwān al-Yamanī. *Šams al-'ulūm wadawā' kalām al-'arab min al-kulūm*. Ed. Karl Vilhelm Zetterstéen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951. 2 vols (incomplete).
- , *Šams* (1999): al-Ḥimyarī, Naṣwān b. Sa'īd b. Naṣwān al-Yamanī. *Šams al-'ulūm wadawā' kalām al-'arab min al-kulūm*. Eds. Ḥusayn b. 'Abdallāh al-'Amrī et al. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Mu'āṣir, 1420/1999. 12 vols.
- Ibn Abī Rabī', *Kāfi*: Ibn Abī Rabī', 'Ubayd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Iṣbīlī l-Quraṣī l-Sabtī. *Al-Kāfi fi l-'iṣṣāḥ 'an masā'il kitāb al-'iḍāḥ*. Ed. Fayṣal al-Ḥafyān. Riad: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, 1422/2001. 3 vols.
- , *Šarḥ*: Ibn Abī Rabī', 'Ubayd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Iṣbīlī l-Quraṣī l-Sabtī. *Al-Basīṭ fi ṣarḥ jumal al-Zajjāji*. Ed. 'Ayyād b. 'Id al-Ṭabīṭī. Beirut: Dār al-Ġarb al-Islāmī, 1407/1986. 2 vols.
- Ibn al-Anbārī, *Asrār*: Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Sa'īd Kamāl al-Dīn. *Asrār al-'arabiyya*. Ed. Christian Friedrich Seybold. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1303/1886.
- , *Bayān*: Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Sa'īd Kamāl al-Dīn. *Al-Bayān fi ḡarīb 'irāb al-Qur'ān*. Eds. Ṭāhā 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Ṭāhā and Muṣṭafā l-Saqqā. Cairo: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī, 1389–1390/1969–1970. 2 vols.
- , *'Inṣāf*: Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Sa'īd Kamāl al-Dīn. *Al-'Inṣāf fi masā'il al-xilāf bayn al-naḥwiyyīna l-baṣriyyīna wal-kūfiyyīna*. Ed. Gotthold Weil. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1913.
- , *Luma'* (1957): Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Sa'īd Kamāl al-Dīn. *Al-'Iḡrāb fi jadal al-'irāb waluma' al-'adilla fi 'uṣūl al-naḥw*. Ed. Sa'īd al-Afġānī. Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Jāmi'a l-Sūriyya, 1377/1957.
- , *Luma'* (1963): Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Sa'īd Kamāl al-Dīn. *Luma' al-'adilla fi 'uṣūl al-naḥw*. Ed. Aṭīyya 'Āmir. Stockholm-Göteborg-Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1963.
- Ibn 'Aqīl, *Musā'id*: Ibn 'Aqīl, 'Abdallāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abdallāh Bahā' al-Dīn al-Ḥāsimī. *Al-Musā'id 'alā tashīl al-fawā'id*. Ed. Muḥammad Kāmil Barakāt. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1400–1405/1980–1984. 4 vols.
- , *Šarḥ*: Ibn 'Aqīl, 'Abdallāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abdallāh Bahā' al-Dīn al-Ḥāsimī. *"Šarḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik"*. In: Dieterici, Friedrich (ed.). *Alfijjah carmen didacticum grammaticum auctore Ibn Mālik et in Alfijjam commentarius quem conscripsit Ibn 'Aqīl*. Leipzig: Sumptibus G. Engelmann, 1851.
- Ibn Barrī, *Šarḥ*: Ibn Barrī, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Barrī b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Maqdisī l-Miṣrī l-Šāfi'ī. *Šarḥ sawāhid al-'iḍāḥ*. Ed. 'Ubayd Muṣṭafā Darwīš. Cairo: Majma' al-Luġa l-'Arabiyya, 1405/1985.

- Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ*: Ibn Burhān al-'Ukbarī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Wāḥid b. 'Alī b. 'Umar b. Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Asadī. *Šarḥ al-luma'*. Ed. Fā'iz Fāris. Kuwait: [al-Majlis al-Waṭanī lil-Ṭaqāfa wal-Funūn wal-Ādāb], 1404/1984. 2 vols.
- Ibn Fāris, *Mujmal*: Ibn Fāris, Abū l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Fāris b. Zakariyyā b. Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb. *Mujmal al-luġa*. Ed. Zuhayr 'Abd al-Muḥsin Sulṭān. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1404/1985. 2 vols.
- , *Šāḥibī*: Ibn Fāris, Abū l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Fāris b. Zakariyyā b. Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb. *Al-Šāḥibī fī fiqh al-luġa wasunan al-'arab fī kalāmihā*. Ed. Moustafa el-Chouémi. Beirut: Mu'assasat Badrān, 1382/1963.
- Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, *'Amālī*: Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Amr 'Uṭmān b. 'Umar b. Abī Bakr al-Mālikī. *'Amālī Ibn al-Ḥāḥib*. Ed. Faxr Šālīḥ Sulaymān Qaddāra. Amman: Dār 'Ammār, 1409/1989. 2 vols.
- , *Kāfiya* (1979): Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Amr 'Uṭmān b. 'Umar b. Abī Bakr al-Mālikī. *Al-Kāfiya fī l-naḥw*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1399/1979. 2 vols.
- , *Kāfiya* (1998): Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Amr 'Uṭmān b. 'Umar b. Abī Bakr al-Mālikī. *"Al-Kāfiya fī l-naḥw"*. In: al-Astarābāḍī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāḥib*. Ed. Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1419/1998. 5 vols.
- , *Šarḥ*: Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Amr 'Uṭmān b. 'Umar b. Abī Bakr al-Mālikī. *Al-Īdāḥ fī šarḥ al-mufaššal*. Ed. Mūsā Bannāy al-'Alilī. Baghdad: Maṭba'at al-'Ānī, 1402/1982. 2 vols.
- Ibn Hišām, *'Awḍaḥ*: * Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *'Awḍaḥ al-masālik 'ilā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1418/1997. 2 vols.
- , *'Trāb*: Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Al-'Trāb 'an qawā'id al-'i'rāb*. Cairo: Maṭba'at Būlāq, 1264/1847–1848.
- , *Jāmi'*: Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Al-Jāmi' al-šaḡir fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Aḥmad Maḥmūd al-Hirmīl. Cairo: Maktabat al-Xānjī, 1400/1980.
- , *Muġnī* (1910): Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Muġnī l-labīb 'an kutub al-'a'arīb*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a l-Šarafiyya, 1328/1910. 2 vols.
- , *Muġnī* (1995): * Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Muġnī l-labīb 'an kutub al-'a'arīb*. Eds. Māzin al-Mubārak and Muḥammad 'Alī Ḥamd Allāh. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995.
- , *Šarḥ al-jumal*: Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Šarḥ jumal al-Zajjāji*. Ed. 'Alī Muḥsin 'Isā Ḥamd Allāh. Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1406/1986.
- , *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1848): Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Šarḥ qaṭr al-nadā waball al-šadā*. Cairo: Maṭba'at Būlāq, 1264/1847–1848. 2 vols.
- , *Šarḥ qaṭr* (1963): Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Šarḥ qaṭr al-nadā waball al-šadā*. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1383/1963.
- , *Šarḥ šudūr*: Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Šarḥ šudūr al-dahab fī ma'rifaṭ kalām al-'arab*. Ed. Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1417/1996.
- , *Taxlīs*: Ibn Hišām, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh. *Taxlīs al-šawāhid watalxīs al-fawā'id*. Ed. 'Abbās Muštafā l-Šālīḥī. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1406/1986.
- Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'*: Ibn Jinnī, 'Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. *Al-Luma' fī l-naḥw (Manuel de grammaire arabe)*. Ed. Hadi M. Kechrida. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1976.
- , *Muḥtasab*: Ibn Jinnī, 'Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. *Al-Muḥtasab fī tabyīn wujūh šawāḍiḍ al-qirā'āt wal-ṭidāḥ 'anhā*. Eds. 'Alī l-Najdī Nāṣif et al. Cairo: Wizārat al-Awqāf, 1424/2004. 2 vols.

- , *Munşif*: Ibn Jinnī, 'Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. *Al-Munşif*. Eds. Ibrāhīm Muşṭafā and 'Abdallāh Amin. Cairo: Maktabat Muşṭafā l-Bābī l-Ḥalabī, 1373–1379/1954–1960. 3 vols.
- , *Sirr*: Ibn Jinnī, 'Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. *Sirr şinā'at al-'irāb*. Ed. Ḥasan Hindāwī. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1405/1985. 2 vols.
- , *Xaşā'iş* (1990): Ibn Jinnī, 'Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. *Al-Xaşā'iş*. Ed. Muḥammad 'Alī l-Najjār. 4th edition. Baghdad: Dār al-Şu'ūn al-Ṭaqāfiyya l-'Āmma, 1990. 3 vols.
- , *Xaşā'iş* (2001): Ibn Jinnī, 'Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ. *Al-Xaşā'iş*. Ed. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Hindāwī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1421/2001. 3 vols.
- Ibn Mālik, 'Alfiyya: Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭā'ī l-Jayyānī. "Al-'Alfiyya". In: Goguyer, Antoine (ed.). *Manuel pour l'étude des grammairiens arabes. La 'Alfiyyah d'Ibnū-Mālik*. Beirut: Imprimerie des Belles-Lettres, 1888.
- , *Şarḥ al-kāfiya*: Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭā'ī l-Jayyānī. *Şarḥ al-kāfiya l-şāfiya*. Eds. 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwaḍ and 'Ādil Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawjūd. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1420/2000. 2 vols.
- , *Şarḥ al-tashīl*: Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭā'ī l-Jayyānī. *Şarḥ al-tashīl*. Eds. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sayyid and Muḥammad Badawī l-Maxtūn. Cairo: Hajr, 1410/1990. 2 vols.
- , *Şarḥ 'umda*: Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭā'ī l-Jayyānī. *Şarḥ 'umdat al-ḥāfiẓ wa'uddat al-lāfiẓ*. Ed. 'Adnān 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dūrī. Baghdad: Maṭbū'āt al-Majma' al-'Ilmī l-'Irāqī (al-'adad al-20), 1397/1977.
- , *Şawāhid*: Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭā'ī l-Jayyānī. *Şawāhid al-tawḍīḥ wal-taṣḥīḥ limuškīlāt al-jāmī'* al-*şaḥīḥ*. Ed. Ṭahā Muḥsin. [Baghdad]: Wizārat al-Awqāf wal-Şu'ūn al-Dīniyya, 1405/1985.
- , *Tashīl*: Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Mālik al-Ṭā'ī l-Jayyānī. *Tashīl al-fawā'id watakmīl al-maqāşid*. Ed. Muḥammad Kāmil Barakāt. Cairo: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī, 1387/1967.
- Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān* (1956): Ibn Manzūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram b. 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Anşārī l-Ifriqī l-Mişrī Jamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl. *Lisān al-'arab*. Beirut: Dār Şādir, 1955–1956. 15 vols.
- , *Lisān* (1986): Ibn Manzūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram b. 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Anşārī l-Ifriqī l-Mişrī Jamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl. *Lisān al-'arab*. Eds. 'Abdallāh 'Alī l-Kabīr et al. [Cairo]: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1981–1986. 9 vols.
- Ibn Mu'tī, 'Alfiyya: Ibn Mu'tī, Abū l-Ḥusayn Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Nūr Zayn al-Dīn al-Zawāwī. *Al-Durra l-'alfiyya fī 'ilm al-'arabiyya*. Ed. Karl Vilhelm Zetterstéen. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1900.
- , *Fuṣūl*: Ibn Mu'tī, Abū l-Ḥusayn Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Nūr Zayn al-Dīn al-Zawāwī. *Al-Fuṣūl al-xamsūna*. Ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī. Cairo: 'Īsā l-Bābī l-Ḥalabī, 1977.
- Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*: * Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Işḥāq Abū l-Faraj. *Al-Fihrist*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa, 1398/1978.
- Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Şarḥ*: Ibn al-Nāẓim, Abū 'Abdallāh Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Şarḥ Ibn al-Nāẓim 'alā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. Muḥammad Bāsil 'Uyūn al-Sūd. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1420/2000.
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Irşād*: Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Şams al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Zar'ī. *Irşād al-sālik 'ilā ḥall 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. Maḥmūd Naşşār. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1425/2004. 2 vols.
- , *Ma'ānī*: Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Şams al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Zar'ī. *Ma'ānī l-'adawāt wal-ḥurūf al-mansūb ilbn Qayyim al-Jawziyya*. Ed. Xālid Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Qimāṭī. Benghazi: Dār al-Kutub al-Waṭaniyya, 2004.
- Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*: Ibn Qutayba, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawarī. *Talqīn al-muta'allim fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Jamāl 'Abd al-'Āṭī Muxaymar. Cairo: Maṭba'at Ḥassān, 1409/1989.
- Ibn Ruşd, *Ḍarūrī*: Ibn Ruşd, Abū l-Walid Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ruşd, al-Ḥafid. *Al-Ḍarūrī fī şinā'at al-naḥw*. Ed. Manşūr 'Alī 'Abd al-Samī'. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī, 1422/2002.

- Ibn al-Šajarī, *ʿAmālī*: Ibn al-Šajarī l-Baġdādī, Abū l-Saʿādāt Hibat Allāh b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Ḥamza. "*Al-ʿAmālī l-Šajariyya: Mā lam yunšar min al-ʿamālī l-Šajariyya lbn al-Šajarī (tuwuffīya 542 hījra)*". In: al-Ḍāmin, Ḥatīm Šālih (ed.). *Nuṣūṣ muḥaqqqaqā fi l-luġa wal-naḥw*. Baghdad: Jāmiʿat Baġdād, 1991. pp. 393–542.
- Ibn al-Sarrāj, *Mūjaz*: Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarī l-Sarrāj al-Naḥwī l-Baġdādī. *Al-Mūjaz fi l-naḥw: Traité de grammaire arabe*. Eds. Moustafa el-Chouémi and Bensalem Damerdjī. Beirut: al-Maktaba l-Luġawiyya l-ʿArabiyya, 1385/1965.
- , *ʿUṣūl* (1973): Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarī l-Sarrāj al-Naḥwī l-Baġdādī. *Al-ʿUṣūl fi l-naḥw*. Ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatli. Baghdad: Maṭbaʿat Salmān al-Aʿẓamī, 1393/1973. 3 vols.
- , *ʿUṣūl* (1996): Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarī l-Sarrāj al-Naḥwī l-Baġdādī. *Al-ʿUṣūl fi l-naḥw*. Ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatli. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1417/1996. 3 vols.
- Ibn Sida, *Muḥkam*: Ibn Sida (Sīduh), Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. (Aḥmad b.?) Ismāʿīl. *Al-Muḥkam wal-muḥīt al-ʿaẓam*. Ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥamid Hindāwī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1421/2001. 11 vols.
- , *Muxaṣṣaṣ*: Ibn Sida (Sīduh), Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. (Aḥmad b.?) Ismāʿīl. *Al-Muxaṣṣaṣ fi l-luġa*. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Būlaq, 1316/1898–1899. 17 vols.
- Ibn Šuqayr, *Muḥallā*: Ibn Šuqayr, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-ʿAbbās b. al-Faraj al-Naḥwī l-Baġdādī. *Al-Muḥallā: Wujūh al-naṣb*. Ed. Fāʾiz Fāris. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1408/1987.
- Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, *Ifṣāḥ*: Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, Abū l-Ḥusayn Sulaymān b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn. *Risālat al-ʿifṣāḥ bibaʿd mā jāʾa min al-xaṭaʾ fi l-ʿiḍāḥ*. Ed. Ḥatīm Šālih al-Ḍāmin. Baghdad: Dār al-Šuʿūn al-Ṭaḳāfiyya l-ʿAmma, 1990.
- Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Ḍarāʾir*: Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muʾmin b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī. *Ḍarāʾir al-šiʿr*. Ed. Ibrāhīm Muḥammad. Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1402/1982.
- , *Muqarririb*: Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muʾmin b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī. *Al-Muqarririb*. Ed. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Sattār al-Jawharī. Baghdad: Maṭbaʿat al-ʿĀnī, 1972.
- , *Šarḥ*: Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muʾmin b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī. *Šarḥ jumal al-Zajjāḏi*. Ed. Šāhib Abū Janāḥ. Baghdad: Dār al-Kutub, 1980–1982. 2 vols.
- Ibn al-Wardī, *Šarḥ*: Ibn al-Wardī, Zayn al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar b. Muẓaffar b. ʿUmar b. Abī l-Fawāris Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Wardī l-Quraṣī l-Bakrī l-Šāfiʿī. *Šarḥ al-tuḥfa l-wardiyya*. Ed. Samīr Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Jawwād. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Ḥassān, 1405/1985.
- Ibn al-Xabbāz, *Šarḥ*: Ibn al-Xabbāz, Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn Ibn ʿAbdallāh Abū l-ʿAbbās. *Al-Ġurra l-maxfiyya lbn al-Xabbāz fi šarḥ al-durra l-ʿalfiyya lbn Muṭi*. Ed. Ḥamid Muḥammad al-ʿAbdalī. Baghdad: Dār al-Anbār, 1991. 2 vols.
- , *Tawjīh*: Ibn al-Xabbāz, Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn Ibn ʿAbdallāh Abū l-ʿAbbās. *Tawjīh al-lumaʾ: Šarḥ kitāb al-lumaʾ liʿAbī l-Faṭḥ Ibn Jinnī*. Ed. Fāyiz Zakī Muḥammad Diyāb. Cairo: Dār al-Salām, 1423/2002.
- Ibn Xarūf, *Šarḥ*: Ibn Xarūf, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Ḥaḍramī l-Iṣbīlī. *Šarḥ kitāb Sibawayhi l-musammā tanfiḥ al-ʿalbāb fi šarḥ ġawāmiḍ al-kitāb*. Ed. Xalifa Muḥammad Xalifa Barīri. Tripoli: Kulīyyat al-Daʿwa l-Islāmiyya, 1996.
- Ibn al-Xaššāb, *Murtajal*: Ibn al-Xaššāb, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Xaššāb. *Al-Murtajal*. Ed. ʿAlī Ḥaydar. Damascus: [Dār al-Ḥikma], 1392/1972.
- Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*: Ibn Yaʿīš, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū l-Baqāʾ Yaʿīš b. ʿAlī b. Yaʿīš al-Ḥalabī. *Ibn Jaʿīš Commentar zu Zamachšarī's Mufaṣṣal*. Ed. Gustav Jahn. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1882–1886. 2 vols.
- al-Irbīlī, *Jawāhir*: al-Irbīlī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn b. ʿAlī Ibn al-Imām Badr al-Dīn b. Muḥammad. *Jawāhir al-ʿadab fi maʾrifat kalām al-ʿarab (muʾjam al-ḥurūf al-ʿarabiyya)*. Ed. Imīl Badīʿ Yaʿqūb. Beirut: Dār al-Nafāʾis, 1412/1991.
- al-Jāmī, *Šarḥ*: Al-Jāmī, Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad. *Al-Fawāʾid al-diyāʾiyya: Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥālib*. Ed. Usāma Ṭāḥā l-Rifāʿī. [Baghdad]: Wizārat al-Awqāf wal-Šuʿūn al-Diniyya, 1403/1983. 2 vols.

- al-Jawharī, *Tāj*: al-Jawharī, Abū Naṣr Ismā'il (b. Naṣr?) b. Ḥammād. *Tāj al-luġa waṣaḥāḥ al-'arabiyya*. n.p., 1292/1875. 2 vols.
- al-Jurjānī, *Jumal*: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Al-Jumal fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Yusri 'Abd al-Ġanī 'Abdallāh. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 1410/1990.
- , *Muqtaṣid*: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Al-Muqtaṣid fī ṣarḥ al-īdāḥ*. Ed. Kāzīm Baḥr al-Marjān. Baghdad: Dār al-Rašid, 1982. 2 vols.
- , *Šarḥ al-jumal*: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Šarḥ al-jumal*. Ed. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Marṣafī. n.p., n.d.
- , *Šarḥ mi'a*: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān. "*Šarḥ mi'a at 'āmil*". In: al-Jurjānī, Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Mi'a at 'āmil: Al-'Awāmil fī l-naḥw*. Ed. John Baillie. Calcutta: Company's press, 1802–1803. Vol I.
- al-Kaffawī, *Kullīyyāt*: al-Kaffawī, Abū l-Baqā' Ayyūb b. Mūsā Ḥusaynī. *Al-Kullīyyāt: Mu'jam fī l-muṣṭalaḥāt wal-furūq al-luġawiyya*. Eds. 'Adnān Darwīš and Muḥammad al-Miṣrī. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1992.
- al-Kisā'i, *Ma'ānī*: al-Kisā'i, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Ḥamza b. 'Abdallāh b. Bahman b. Fayrūz. *Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān*. Ed. 'Isā Ṣaḥāta 'Isā. Cairo: Dār Qubā', 1998.
- al-Makkūdī, *Šarḥ*: al-Makkūdī, Abū Zayd 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. Šāliḥ. *Šarḥ al-Makkūdī 'alā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. Fāṭima Rāšid al-Rājiḥī. [Kuwait]: Jāmi'at al-Kuwait, 1993. 2 vols.
- al-Mālaqī, *Raṣf*: al-Mālaqī, Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Nūr b. Aḥmad b. Rāšid. *Raṣf al-mabānī fī ṣarḥ ḥurūf al-ma'ānī*. Ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad al-Xarrāṭ. Damascus: Majma' al-Luġa l-'Arabiyya, 1975.
- al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab*: al-Mubarrad, Abū l-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazid b. 'Abd al-Akbar al-Tumālī l-Azdī. *Al-Muqtaḍab*. Ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Xāliq 'Uḍayma. Cairo: Mu'assasat Dār al-Taḥrīr, 1385–1388/1965–1968. 4 vols.
- al-Murādī, *Janā*: al-Murādī, Ibn Umm Qāsim, Badr al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. Qāsim b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī. *Al-Janā l-dānī fī ḥurūf al-ma'ānī*. Eds. Faxr al-Dīn Qabāwa and Muḥammad Nadīm Fāḍil. 2nd edition. Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1403/1983.
- al-Muṭarrizī, *Miṣbāḥ*: al-Muṭarrizī, Burḥān al-Dīn Abū l-Faṭḥ (Abū l-Muzaḥḥar) Nāṣir b. Abī l-Makārim 'Abd al-Sayyid b. 'Alī l-Xwārazmī. *Al-Miṣbāḥ fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Maqbūl 'Alī l-Ni'ma. Beirut: Dār al-Baṣā'ir al-Islāmiyya, 1414/1993.
- al-Naḍr b. Šumayl, *Risāla*: al-Naḍr b. Šumayl b. Xaraša l-Māzinī Abū l-Ḥasan. "*Risāla fī l-ḥurūf al-'arabiyya*". In: Cheikho, P. L. and Auguste Haffner (eds.). *Al-Bulġa fī šuḍūr al-luġa: Dix anciens traités de philologie arabe*. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1914. pp. 159–167.
- al-Naḥḥās, *Y'rāb*: al-Naḥḥās, Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'il b. Yūnus. *Y'rāb al-Qur'ān*. Ed. Zuhayr Ġāzī Zāhid. Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1409/1988. 5 vols.
- , *Šarḥ*: al-Naḥḥās, Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ismā'il b. Yūnus. *Šarḥ 'abyāt Sibawayhi*. Ed. Zuhayr Ġāzī Zāhid. Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1406/1986.
- al-Rummānī, *Ḥudūd*: al-Rummānī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Isā b. 'Alī b. 'Abdallāh. "*Al-Ḥudūd fī l-naḥw*". In: Jawād, Muṣṭafā and Yūsuf Ya'qūb Maskūnī (eds.). *Rasā'il fī l-naḥw wal-luġa*. Baghdad: al-Mu'assasa l-'Āmma lil-Šaḥāfa wal-Ṭibā'a, 1388/1969. pp. 37–50.
- , *Ma'ānī*: al-Rummānī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Isā b. 'Alī b. 'Abdallāh. *Ma'ānī l-ḥurūf*. Ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Ismā'il Šalabī. Jeddah: Dār al-Šurūq, 1401/1981.
- , *Manāzil*: al-Rummānī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Isā b. 'Alī b. 'Abdallāh. "*Manāzil al-ḥurūf*". In: Jawād, Muṣṭafā and Yūsuf Ya'qūb Maskūnī (eds.). *Rasā'il fī l-naḥw wal-luġa*. Baghdad: al-Mu'assasa l-'Āmma lil-Šaḥāfa wal-Ṭibā'a, 1388/1969. pp. 51–79.
- , *Risālatānī*: * al-Rummānī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Isā b. 'Alī b. 'Abdallāh. *Risālatānī fī l-luġa: (1) Manāzil al-ḥurūf, (2) Al-Ḥudūd*. Ed. Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'i. Amman: Dār al-Fikr, 1984.
- , *Šarḥ*: al-Rummānī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Isā b. 'Alī b. 'Abdallāh. "*Šarḥ kitāb Sibawayhi*". In: al-Mubārak, Māzin. *Al-Rummānī l-Naḥwī fī ḍaw' ṣarḥiḥi likitāb Sibawayhi*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1974.

- al-Šāgānī, *Takmila*: al-Šāgānī, Raḍī l-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Ḥaydar b. ‘Alī b. Ismā‘il al-Quraṣī l-‘Adawī l-‘Umārī. *Al-Takmila wal-ḍayl wal-šila likitāb tajj al-luḡa waṣaḥāḥ al-‘arabiyya*. Eds. ‘Abd al-‘Alīm al-Ṭaḥāwī and ‘Abd al-Ḥamid Ḥasan. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Dār al-Kutub, 1970–1979. 6 vols.
- al-Šāhib Ibn ‘Abbād, *al-Muḥīṭ*: al-Šāhib Ibn ‘Abbād, Kāfī l-kufāt, Abū l-Qāsim Ismā‘il b. ‘Abbād b. al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abbād b. Aḥmad b. Idrīs. *Al-Muḥīṭ fi l-luḡa*. Ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl Yāsīn. Beirut: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1994. 11 vols.
- Šalāḥ al-Dīn, *Šarḥ*: Šalāḥ al-Dīn b. ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. Abī l-Qāsim. *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāḡib*. Ed. Muḥammad Jum‘a Ḥasan Nab‘a. Sanaa: Mu‘assasat al-Imām Zayd b. ‘Alī l-Ṭaḡāfiyya, 1424/2003. 2 vols.
- al-Šan‘ānī, *Tahḏīb*: al-Šan‘ānī, Sābiq al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Ya‘īš. *Al-Tahḏīb al-wasīṭ fi l-naḥw*. Ed. Faxr Šāliḥ Sulaymān Qaddāra. Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1411/1991.
- al-Šantamarī, *Nukat*: al-Šantamarī, Abū l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Sulaymān al-Andalusī l-Naḥwī. *Al-Nukat fi taḥṣīr kitāb Sibawayhi*. Ed. Zuhayr ‘Abd al-Muḥsin Sulṭān. Kuwait: Ma‘had al-Maxṭūṭāt al-‘Arabiyya, 1407/1987. 2 vols.
- , *Taḥṣīl* (1898): al-Šantamarī, Abū l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Sulaymān al-Andalusī l-Naḥwī. “*Šarḥ al-šawāhid al-musammā taḥṣīl ‘ayn al-ḡaḥab min ma‘dīn jawhar al-‘adab fi ‘ilm majāzāt al-‘arab*”. On the bottom of Sibawayhi, Abū Bišr ‘Amr b. ‘Uṭmān. *Kitāb Sibawayhi*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Būlāq, 1316–1317/1898–1900. 2 vols.
- , *Taḥṣīl* (1992): al-Šantamarī, Abū l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Sulaymān al-Andalusī l-Naḥwī. *Taḥṣīl ‘ayn al-ḡaḥab min ma‘dīn jawhar al-‘adab fi ‘ilm majāzāt al-‘arab*. Ed. Zuhayr ‘Abd al-Muḥsin Sulṭān. Baghdad: Dār al-Šu‘ūn al-Ṭaḡāfiyya l-‘Āmma, 1992.
- al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī, *Šarḥ*: al-Jurjānī, al-Sayyid al-Šarīf, ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī. *Šarḥ ‘abyāt al-mufaṣṣal wal-mutawassīṭ lil-‘Allāma Jār Allāh Abī l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ‘Umar al-Zamaxšarī*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥamid Jāsīm Muḥammad al-Fayyāḍ al-Kubaysī. Beirut: Dār al-Bašā‘ir al-Islāmiyya, 1421/2000.
- , *Ta‘rīfāt*: al-Jurjānī, al-Sayyid al-Šarīf, ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī. *Al-Ta‘rīfāt*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Arabī, 1405/1985.
- al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, *Šarḥ*: al-Šarīf al-Kūfī, Jamāl al-Šaraf Abū l-Barakāt al-‘Alawī l-Zaydī, ‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad. *Al-Bayān fi šarḥ al-luma‘ llln Jinnī*. Ed. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ḥamawīyya. Amman: Dār ‘Ammār, 1423/2002.
- al-Saxāwī, *Šarḥ*: al-Saxāwī, ‘Ālam al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Šamad b. ‘Abd al-Aḥad b. ‘Abd al-Ġalīb b. ‘Uṭāš al-Hamadānī l-Miṣrī. *Al-Mufaḍḍal fi šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal (bāb al-ḥurūf)*. Ed. Yūsuf al-Ḥuškī. Amman: Wizārat al-Ṭaḡāfa, 2002.
- al-Šaymarī, *Tabṣira*: al-Šaymarī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Alī b. Iṣḥāq. *Al-Tabṣira wal-taḍkira*. Ed. Fathī Aḥmad Muṣṭafā ‘Alī l-Dīn. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1402/1982. 2 vols.
- Sibawayhi, *Kitāb*: Sibawayhi, Abū Bišr ‘Amr b. ‘Uṭmān. *Le livre de Sibawaihi, Traité de grammaire arabe*. Texte arabe publié par Hartwig Derenbourg. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881–1889. 2 vols.
- , *Kitāb (Būlāq)*: Sibawayhi, Abū Bišr ‘Amr b. ‘Uṭmān. *Kitāb Sibawayhi, wabihāmišihī taqrīrāt wazubad min šarḥ Abī Sa‘īd al-Sirāfi wabi‘asfal al-šahīfa bil-qā‘ida l-šāḡira šarḥ al-šawāhid al-musammā taḥṣīl ‘ayn al-ḡaḥab min ma‘dīn jawhar al-‘adab fi ‘ilm majāzāt al-‘arab*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Būlāq, 1316–1317/1898–1900. 2 vols.
- al-Sirāfi, *‘Abyāt*: al-Sirāfi, Abū Muḥammad Yūsuf b. al-Ḥasan. *Šarḥ ‘abyāt Sibawayhi*. Ed. Muḥammad ‘Alī Sulṭānī. Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Ḥijāz, 1396/1976. 2 vols.
- al-Sirāfi, *‘Axbār*: al-Sirāfi, Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Marzubān. *‘Axbār al-naḥwiyyina l-baṣriyyina*. Ed. Fritz Krenkow. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1936.
- , *Šarḥ (Būlāq)*: al-Sirāfi, Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Marzubān. “*Šarḥ kitāb Sibawayhi*”. In the margins of Sibawayhi, Abū Bišr ‘Amr b. ‘Uṭmān, *Kitāb Sibawayhi*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Būlāq, 1316–1317/1898–1900. 2 vols.
- , *Šarḥ (Cairo)*: al-Sirāfi, Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Marzubān. *Šarḥ kitāb Sibawayhi*. Ed. Ramaḡān ‘Abd al-Tawwāb. Cairo: al-Hay‘a l-Miṣriyya l-‘Āmma lil-Kitāb, 1986–. 6 vols (incomplete).

- al-Širbīnī, *Nūr*: al-Širbīnī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Nūr al-sajīyya fī ḥall 'alfāz al-'ajurrūmiyya, Arab linguistics: An introductory classical text with translation and notes*. Ed. Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1981.
- al-Suhaylī, *Natā'ij*: al-Suhaylī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abdallāh Abū l-Qāsim. *Natā'ij al-fikr fī l-naḥw*. Eds. 'Adil Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawjūd and 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwaḍ. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1412/1992.
- al-Suyūṭī, *Alfiyya*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Alfiyyat al-Suyūṭī l-naḥwiyya*. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya, n.d.
- , *'Ašbāh (1942)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Al-'Ašbāh wal-naẓā'ir fī l-naḥw*. 2nd edition. Hyderabad: Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uṭmāniyya, 1359–1361/1940–1942. 4 vols.
- , *'Ašbāh (1975)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Al-'Ašbāh wal-naẓā'ir fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Ṭahā 'Abd al-Ra'ūf Sa'd. Cairo: Maktabat al-Kullīyyāt al-Azhariyya, 1395/1975. 4 vols.
- , *'Ašbāh (1998)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Al-'Ašbāh wal-naẓā'ir fī l-naḥw*. Eds. 'Abd al-Ilāh Aḥmad Nabḥān et al. Damascus: Majma' al-Luġa l-'Arabiyya, 1406–1419/1985–1998. 4 vols; Nabḥān, 'Abd al-Ilāh Aḥmad, *al-Faḥāris al-mufaṣṣala lil-'ašbāh wal-naẓā'ir fī l-naḥw lil-Suyūṭī*. Cairo: Ma'had al-Maxṭūṭāt al-'Arabiyya, 1998.
- , *Ham'*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Ham' al-hawāmi' fī šarḥ jam' al-jawāmi'*. Ed. 'Abd al-'Āl Sālim Mukrim. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1413/1992. 6 vols.
- , *Itqān (1857)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Al-Itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*. Eds. Aloys Sprenger et al. Calcutta: [Asiatic Society of Bengal], 1857.
- , *Itqān (1901)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Al-Itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a l-Azhariyya, 1318/1900–1901.
- , *Šarḥ al-'alfiyya*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Šarḥ matn al-'alfiyya fī l-naḥw wal-šarf*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a l-Maḥmūdiyya, n.d.
- , *Šarḥ šawāhid (1904)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Šarḥ šawāhid al-muġnī*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a l-Bahiyya, 1322/1904.
- , *Šarḥ šawāhid (1966)*: al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn al-Xuḍayrī. *Šarḥ šawāhid al-muġnī*. Damascus: Lajnat al-Turāt al-'Arabī, [1966]. 2 vols.
- al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*: * al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarir b. Yazīd b. Xālid. *Jāmi' al-bayān 'an ta'wīl 'āy al-Qur'ān*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1405/1985. 30 vols.
- Ṭa'lab, *Majālis*: Ṭa'lab, Abū l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Zayd b. Sayyār Šaybānī. *Majālis Ṭa'lab*. Ed. 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1956. Vol I.
- al-'Ukbarī, *Lubāb*: al-'Ukbarī, 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn Abū l-Baqā' Muḥibb al-Dīn. *Al-Lubāb fī 'ilal al-bīnā' wal-ī'rāb*. Ed. Ġāzī Muxtār Ṭulaymāt. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Mu'āšir, 1416/1995. 2 vols.
- , *Mašūf*: al-'Ukbarī, 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn Abū l-Baqā' Muḥibb al-Dīn. *Al-Mašūf al-mu'lam fī tartīb al-'iṣlāḥ 'alā ḥurūf al-mu'jam*. Ed. Yāsīn Muḥammad al-Sawwās. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1403/1983. 2 vols.
- , *Tibyān*: * al-'Ukbarī, 'Abdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn Abū l-Baqā' Muḥibb al-Dīn. *Al-Tibyān fī 'i'rāb al-Qur'ān*. Ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī. n.p., n.d. 2 vols.
- al-Uṣmūnī, *Šarḥ*: al-Uṣmūnī, Abū l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Īsā. *Šarḥ al-Uṣmūnī 'alā 'alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Eds. Ḥasan Ḥamd and Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1419/1998. 4 vols.
- al-Warrāq, *Ilal*: al-Warrāq, Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. al-'Abbās al-Baġdādī. *Al-Ilal fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Māzin al-Mubārak. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 2000.

- al-Xalil, 'Ayn: al-Xalil b. Aḥmad b. 'Amr b. Tamīm al-Farāhidī l-Azdi l-Yaḥmadī l-Baṣrī Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Kitāb al-'ayn*. Eds. Maḥdi l-Maxzūmī and Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'ī. Cairo, n.d. 8 vols.
- al-Xwārazmī, *Mafātīḥ*: al-Xwārazmī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Kātib. *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm*. Ed. Jawdat Faxr al-Dīn. Beirut: Dār al-Manāhil, 1411/1991.
- al-Xwārazmī, *Šarḥ al-jumal*: al-Xwārazmī, Šadr al-Afāḍil al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥusayn. *Taršīḥ al-'ilal fī šarḥ al-jumal*. Ed. 'Ādil Muḥsin Šalīm al-'Umayrī. Mecca: Jāmi'at Umm al-Qurā, 1419/1998.
- , *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal*: al-Xwārazmī, Šadr al-Afāḍil al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥusayn. *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal fī šun'at al-'i'rāb*. Ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sulaymān al-'Uṭaymīn. Beirut: Dār al-Ḡarb al-Islāmī, 1990. 4 vols.
- al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* (1889): al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī l-Ḥanafī. *Tāj al-'arūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a l-Xayriyya, 1306–1307/1888–1889. 10 vols.
- , *Tāj* (1994): al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī l-Ḥanafī. *Šarḥ al-qāmūs al-musammā tāj al-'arūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1414/1994. 20 vols.
- al-Zajjāj, *Ṭrāb*: al-Zajjāj, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. al-Sarī. *Ṭrāb al-Qur'ān*. Ed. Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī. Cairo: Wizārat al-Taḳāfa wal-Iršād al-Qawmī, 1963–1964. 2 vols.
- , *Ma'ānī* (1973): al-Zajjāj, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. al-Sarī. *Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān*. Ed. 'Abd al-Jalīl 'Abduḥ Šalabī. Beirut: al-Maktaba l-'Ašriyya, 1973. 2 vols.
- , *Ma'ānī* (1994): al-Zajjāj, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. al-Sarī. *Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān*. Ed. 'Abd al-Jalīl 'Abduḥ Šalabī. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīṭ, 1414/1994. 5 vols.
- al-Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf*: al-Zajjājī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq. *Ḥurūf al-ma'ānī*. Ed. 'Alī Tawfiq al-Ḥamad. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1406/1986.
- , *Jumal*: al-Zajjājī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq. *Al-Jumal fī l-naḥw*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Abī Šanab (Mohammed Ben Cheneb). Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1957.
- , *Lāmāt*: al-Zajjājī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq. *Al-Lāmāt*. Ed. Māzin al-Mubārak. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1389/1969.
- , *Majālis*: al-Zajjājī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq. *Majālis al-'ulamā'*. Ed. 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Kuwait: Wizārat al-Iršād wal-Anbā', 1962.
- al-Zamaxšarī, *Aḥqār*: al-Zamaxšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar. *Al-'Aḥqār l-naḥwiyya*. Ed. Muṣṭafā l-Ḥudārī. Hamah: Maktabat al-Ġazālī, 1969.
- , *Mufaṣṣal*: al-Zamaxšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar. *Al-Mufaṣṣal fī šun'at al-'i'rāb*. Ed. J. P. Broch. 2nd edition. Christiania: Libreria P. T. Mallingii, 1879.
- , *Muqaddima*: al-Zamaxšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar. *Samachscharii Lexicon arabicum persicum cum indice arabico (Muqaddimat al-'adab)*. Ed. Ioannes Godofredus Wetzstein. Leipzig: I. A. Barth, 1843–1850.
- , *Šarḥ*: al-Zamaxšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar. *Šarḥ al-faṣīḥ*. Ed. Ibrāhīm b. 'Abdallāh b. Jumhūr al-Ġamidī. Mecca: Jāmi'at Umm al-Qurā, 1417/1997. 2 vols.
- , *'Unmūdaj*: al-Zamaxšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar. *"Kitāb al-'Unmūdaj [sic] fī l-naḥw, ta'līf al-Imām al-'Allāma Jār Allāh Abī l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. 'Umar al-Zamaxšarī, waqad šaraḥahu Jamāl al-Milla wal-Dīn Muḥammad b. Šams al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ġanī l-Ardabilī"*. In: de Sacy, M. Le Baron Silvestre (ed.). *Anthologie grammaticale arabe*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1829. pp. 99–118.
- al-Zubaydī l-Išbīlī, *Istidrāk*: al-Zubaydī l-Išbīlī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Abdallāh b. Maḍḥij. *Al-Istidrāk 'alā Sibawayhi fī kitāb al-'abniyya wal-ziyādāt 'alā mā 'awradahu fihi muḥaqqāban*. Ed. Ignazio Guidi. Rome: Accademia dei Lincei, 1890.
- , *Wāḍiḥ*: al-Zubaydī l-Išbīlī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Abdallāh b. Maḍḥij. *Al-Wāḍiḥ*. Ed. 'Abd al-Karīm Xalīfa. Amman: al-Jāmi'a l-Urduniyya, 1396/1976.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Aartun, *Lan*: Aartun, Kjell. "Arabisch *Lan*". In: *Oriens*, XXV/XXVI (1976). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 187–189.
- , *Particules*: Aartun, Kjell. *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen*. Berlin: Butzon und Bercker, 1974. 2 vols.
- , *Subjunctive*: Aartun, Kjell. "Sentences with specific particles and the subjunctive in Arabic". In: *Oriens*, XXVII/XXVIII (1981). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 313–316.
- Abū l-Hayjā', *Fahāris*: Abū l-Hayjā', Aḥmad. *Fahāris lisān al-ʿarab*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1407/1987. 7 vols.
- Abū l-Makārim, *Ẓawāhir*: Abū l-Makārim, ʿAlī. *Al-Ẓawāhir al-luḡawiyya fi l-turāt al-naḥwī: Al-Ẓawāhir al-tarkibiyya*. Cairo: al-Dār al-Ḥadīṭa, 1387/1968. Vol I.
- al-ʿAnī-Parkinson, *Bibliography*: Al-Ani, Salman H. and Dilworth Parkinson. *Arabic linguistics bibliography: 1979–1995*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club Publications, 1996.
- al-Anṣārī, *al-Farrāʾ*: al-Anṣārī, Aḥmad Makki. *Abū Zakariyyā l-Farrāʾ wamaḏhabuhū fi l-naḥw wal-luḡa*. Cairo: al-Majlis al-Aʿlā liRiʾāyat al-Funūn wal-Ādāb wal-ʿUlūm al-Ijtīmāʿiyya, 1384/1964.
- Arberry, *Koran*: Arberry, Arthur J. *The Koran interpreted*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996. Reprint. Originally published: London: Allen & Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1955. 2 vols.
- Ayoub, *Tamṭil*: Ayoub, Georgine. « De ce qui 'ne se dit pas' dans le livre de Sībawayhi: La notion de *tamṭil* ». In: Versteegh, Kees and Michael G. Carter (eds.). *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar. Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1990. pp. 1–15.
- Baʿalbakī, *Dirāsāt*: Baʿalbakī, Ramzi. *Fiḡh al-ʿarabiyya l-muqārīn: Dirāsāt fi ʿaswāt al-ʿarabiyya waṣarfihā*. Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm lil-Malāyīna, 1999.
- , *Fāʾ*: Baalbaki, Ramzi. "Bāb al-fāʾ [fāʾ + subjunctive] in Arabic grammatical sources". In: *Arabica* XLVIII/2 (2001). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 186–209.
- , *Review*: Baalbaki, Ramzi. "Review of Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*". In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* L (2005). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 413–416.
- , *Wāw*: Baalbaki, Ramzi. "On the meaning of the *wāw al-maʿiyya* construction". In: *Journal of the American Association of Teachers of Arabic* XIX (1986). Chicago: The American Association of Teachers of Arabic. pp. 7–17.
- Bakalla, *Bibliography*: Bakalla, M. H. *Arabic linguistics: An Introduction and bibliography (al-Lisāniyyāt al-ʿarabiyya: Muqaddima wabibliyūgrāfiyya)*. New York: Mansell, 1983.
- Beck, *ʿIdān*: Beck, P. Edmund. "Die Partikel 'Idhan' bei al-Farrāʾ und Sibawaih". In: *Orientalia* XV (1946). Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum. pp. 432–439.
- Bergter, *ʾInna*: Bergter, Annette. *Das Kapitel inna wa-aḥawātuhā aus dem "Manḥaḡ as-sālik" des Grammatikers Abū Ḥayyān al-Ġarnātī (1256–1344)*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1988.
- Bernards, *al-Jarmī*: Bernards, Monique P. L. M. "The Basran grammarian ʾAbū ʿUmar al-Ġarmī: His position between Sībawayhi and Mubarrad". In: Versteegh, Kees and Michael G. Carter (eds.). *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar. Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1990. pp. 35–47.
- Blanc, *Linguistics*: Blanc, Haim. "Linguistics among the Arabs". In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.). *Current trends in linguistics XIII (1975). Historiography of linguistics*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton. pp. 1265–1283.
- Blau, *Grammar*: Blau, Joshua. *A grammar of medieval Judeo-Arabic* (in Hebrew). 2nd enlarged edition. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1980. Reprinted 1995.
- Brockelmann, *GAL*: Brockelmann, Carl. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 2nd edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1937–1949. 2 vols and 3 suppl. vols.

- , *Grammatik*: Socin, Albert. *Arabische Grammatik* (10. Auf. von C. Brockelmann). Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1929.
- , *Grundriss*: Brockelmann, Carl. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen in zwei Bänden*. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1908–1913.
- Carter, *Experiment*: Carter, Michael G. “A 16th century grammatical experiment that failed”. In: *Arabica* XXVI (1979). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 267–273.
- , *Sabab*: Carter, Michael G. “The term *sabab* in Arabic grammar”. In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* XV (1985). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 53–66.
- , *Šarf*: Carter, Michael G. « *Šarf* et *Hilāf*, contribution à l’histoire de la grammaire arabe ». In: *Arabica* XX (1973). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 292–304.
- Cheikho-Durand, *Elementa*: Cheikho, Louis and A. Durand. *Elementa grammaticae Arabicae*. Beirut: Typographia Patrum Societatis Jesu, 1896–1897.
- de Sacy, *Anthologie*: de Sacy, M. Le Baron Silvestre. *Anthologie grammaticale arabe, ou morceaux choisis de divers grammairiens et scholiastes arabes, avec une traduction française et des notes; pouvant faire suite à la Chrestomathie arabe*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1829.
- , *Chrestomathie*: de Sacy, M. Le Baron Silvestre. *Chrestomathie arabe, ou extraits de divers écrivains arabes, tant en prose qu’en vers, avec une traduction française et des notes, à l’usage des élèves de l’École royale et spéciale des langues orientales vivantes*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1826. 2 vols.
- , *Grammaire*: de Sacy, M. Le Baron Silvestre. *Grammaire arabe à l’usage des élèves de l’École spéciale des langues orientales vivantes; avec figures*. 2nd edition. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1831. 2 vols.
- Dévényi, *al-Farrā’*: Dévényi, Kinga. “On Farrā’s linguistic methods in his work *Ma’ānī l-Qur’ān*”. In: Versteegh, Kees and Michael G. Carter (eds.). *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar. Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1990. pp. 101–110.
- Dieterici, *Translation*: Dieterici, Friedrich. *Ibn ‘Aqīl’s Commentar zur Alfīja des Ibn Mālik*. Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmlers Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1852.
- Dirah, *Naḥw*: Dirah, al-Muxtār. *Dirāsa fī l-naḥw al-kūfī min xilāl ma’ānī l-Qur’ān lil-Farrā’*. Beirut: Dār Qutayba, 1411/1991.
- EALL: *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Eds. K. Versteegh, M. Eid, A. Elgibali, M. Woidich and A. Zaborski. Leiden-Boston: E. J. Brill, 2005–2009. 5 vols.
- EP: *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2nd edition. Leiden-London: E. J. Brill, 1960–2004. 12 vols.
- Erpenius, *Grammar*: Erpenius, Thomas. *Grammatica Arabica*. Ed. Albertus Schultens. Leiden: Samuelem Luchtmans et Filium, Academiae Typographos, 1748.
- Ewald, *Grammar*: Ewald, Geo. Henric. Aug. *Grammatica critica linguae arabicae*. Leipzig: Sumtibus Libraire Hahnianae, 1831–1833. 2 vols.
- Fischer, ‘An: Fischer, Wolfdietrich. “Dass-Sätze mit *أَنَّ* und *أَنَّ*”. In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* I (1978). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 24–31.
- , *Grammatik*: Fischer, Wolfdietrich. *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972.
- , *Grammatik (translation)*: Fischer, Wolfdietrich. *A grammar of classical Arabic*. Translated from German by Jonathan Rodgers. 3rd edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- , *Perioden*: Fischer, Wolfdietrich. “Die Perioden des klassischen Arabisch”. In: *Abr Nahrain* XII (1972). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 15–18.
- Fischer-Bräunlich, *Šawāhid*: Fischer, A. and E. Bräunlich. *Schawāhid-Indices: Indices der Reimwörter und der Dichter der in den arabischen Schawāhid-Kommentaren und in verwandten Werken erläuterten Belegverse*. Leipzig-Vienna: Harrassowitz, 1945.
- Fleisch, *Arabe*: Fleisch, Henri. *L’arabe classique: Esquisse d’une structure linguistique*. 2nd edition. Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1968.
- , *Philologie*: Fleisch, Henri. *Traité de philologie arabe*. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1961–1979. 2 vols.

- , *Yaqṭula*: Fleisch, Henri. « *Yaqṭula* cananéen et subjonctif arabe ». In: Fleischhammer, Manfred (ed.). *Studia orientalia in memoriam Caroli Brockelmann: Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martial-Lutheal-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* XVII (1968). Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg. pp. 65–76.
- Fleischer, *Schriften*: Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht. *Kleinere Schriften*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1885–1888. 3 vols (Vol I: Parts 1+2. Leipzig, 1885; Vols II–III. Leipzig, 1888). Reprint. Originally published: *Beiträge zur arabischen Sprachkunde: Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kgl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Classe*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1863–1884.
- Freytag, *Lexicon*: Freytag, Georg Wilhelm. *Lexicon arabico-latinum: Praesertim ex Djeuharii Firuzabadiique et aliorum arabum operibus adhibitis golii quoque et aliorum libris confectum*. Halle: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1830–1837. 4 vols.
- Fück, *Studien*: Fück, Johann. *Die arabischen Studien in Europa, bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1955.
- Gaudefroy-Demombynes-Blachère, *Grammaire*: Gaudefroy-Demombynes, M. and R. Blachère. *Grammaire de l'arabe classique*. Paris: Librairie orientale et américaine, 1937.
- Ġazlān, *Ḥattā*: Ġazlān, ‘Abdallāh. *Qaḍāyā fī l-luġa l-ṭabīʿiyya watārīx al-fikr (Naẓariyyat ḥattā ‘ind Sibawayhi)*. Fez: Info-Print, 2003.
- Hājji Xalifa, *Kašf*: * Hājji Xalifa, Kātib Čelebi, Muṣṭafā b. ‘Abdallāh. *Kašf al-ẓunūn ‘an ‘asāmī l-kutub wal-funūn*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1413/1992. 2 vols.
- Hasan, *Naḥw*: Hasan, ‘Abbās. *Al-Naḥw al-wāfi*. Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1987. 4 vols.
- Hava, *Dictionary*: Hava, J. G. *Al-Farāʿid Arabic-English Dictionary*. Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1982.
- Hegazi, *al-Sirāfi*: Hegazi, Mahmoud M. F. *Abū Saʿīd as-Sirāfi, der Sibawayth-Kommentator als Grammatiker* (Inaugural-Dissertation). Munich, 1971.
- Holes, *Arabic*: Holes, Clive. *Modern Arabic: structures, functions and varieties*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Howell, *Grammar*: Howell, Mortimer Sloper. *A grammar of the classical Arabic language, translated and compiled from the works of the most approved native or naturalized authorities*. Allahabad: Government Press, 1880–1911. 4 vols.
- Ibn El Farouk, *Subjonctif*: Ibn El Farouk, Abdelhamid. « La fiction du subjonctif en arabe littéral et la question du muḍārīʿ ». In: *La Linguistique : Revue de la Société Internationale de Linguistique Fonctionnelle* XXX/2 (1994). Paris: Presses universitaires de France. pp. 121–130.
- Jahn, *Translation*: Jahn, Gustav. *Sibawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik, übersetzt und erklärt von Dr. G. Jahn*. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1895–1900. 2 vols. Reprinted Hildesheim, 1969.
- Janhawītši, *Xilāf*: Janhawītši, Hudā. *Xilāf al-Axfaš al-Awsaṭ ‘an Sibawayhi*. Amman: Maktabat Dār al-Ṭaqāfa, 1993.
- Kāzim, *Naḥw*: Kāzim, Kāzim Ibrāhīm. *Al-Naḥw al-kūfi: Mabāḥiṭ fī ma‘ānī l-Qurʾān lil-Farrāʾ*. Beirut: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1417/1998.
- Kinberg, *al-Farrāʾ*: Kinberg, Naphtali. *A lexicon of al-Farrāʾ's terminology in his Qurʾān commentary: With full definitions, English summaries, and extensive citations*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996. (*Handbuch der Orientalistik*: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten; Bd. 23.)
- Kosegarten, *Grammatica*: Kosegartenius, Joan. Godofr. Lud. *Grammatica linguae arabicae*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1838. (pp. 1–688, without a title, incomplete)
- Lane, *Lexicon*: Lane, Edward William. *An Arabic-English lexicon derived from the best and most copious eastern sources*. London-Edinburgh: Longman, 1863–1893. 8 vols.
- Levin, *ʿamal*: Levin, Aryeh. “The fundamental principles of the Arab grammarians’ theory of ‘amal’”. In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XIX (1995). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 214–232. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article I.
- , *ʿAsmāʾ*: Levin, Aryeh. “The category of *asmāʾ al-fiʿl* in Arabic grammar”. In: Dévényi, K. and T. Iványi (eds.). *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 3–4. Budapest: Eotvos Lorand University Chair for Arabic Studies, 1991. pp. 247–256. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article X.

- , *Dialectology*: Levin, Aryeh. "The first book of Arabic dialectology: Sibawayhi's *al-Kitāb*". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XXIII (1999). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 208–220.
- , *Distinction*: Levin, Aryeh. "The distinction between nominal and verbal sentences according to the Arab grammarians". In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* XV (1985). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 118–127.
- , *Ḥillī*: Levin, Aryeh. "The vernacular poetry of Ṣafīyy al-Dīn al-Ḥillī: A source for the reconstruction of Iraqi Arabic in the 14th century". In: *Israel Oriental Studies* V (1975). Tel Aviv University: Faculty of Humanities. pp. 259–276. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article XVII.
- , *ʾImāla*: Levin, Aryeh. "The authenticity of Sibawayhi's description of the *ʾimāla*". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XV (1992). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 74–93. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article XIII.
- , *Kalima*: Levin, Aryeh. "The medieval Arabic term *kalima* and the modern linguistic term morpheme: similarities and differences". In: Sharon, M. (ed.). *Studies in Islamic history and civilization in honour of Professor David Ayalon*. Jerusalem: Cana, 1986. pp. 423–446. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article VII.
- , *Kāna*: Levin, Aryeh. "Sibawayhi's view of the syntactic structure of *kāna wa'axawātuhā*". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* I (1979). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 185–213. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article V.
- , *Linguistic*: Levin, Aryeh. *Arabic linguistic thought and dialectology*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1998.
- , *Mabniyy*: Levin, Aryeh. "The syntactic technical term *al-mabniyy* 'alayhi". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* VI (1985). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 299–352. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article VI.
- , *Mubtada*: Levin, Aryeh. "Sibawayhi's view of *al-mubtada*' and *al-ibtida*". In: Maman, A. et al. (eds.). *Sha'arei lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish languages*. Vol III: *Modern Hebrew and Jewish languages*. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007. pp. 78–101.
- , *Musnad*: Levin, Aryeh. "The grammatical terms *al-musnad*, *al-musnad* 'ilayhi and *al-'isnād*". In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* CI/2 (April–June 1981). New Haven: American Oriental Society. pp. 145–165. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article II.
- , *Poetry*: Levin, Aryeh. "Sibawayhi's attitude to the language of poetry". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XXVIII (2003). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 278–288.
- , *Prepositions*: Levin, Aryeh. "The views of the Arab grammarians on the classification and syntactic function of prepositions". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* X (1987). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 342–367. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article IX.
- , *Qur'ān*: Levin, Aryeh. "Sibawayhi's attitude to the language of the Qur'ān". In: Arazi, Albert et al. (eds.). *Israel Oriental Studies* XIX (1999). *Compilation and creation in adab and luḡa: Studies in memory of Naphtali Kinberg (1948–1997)*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns. pp. 267–272.
- , *Sibawayhi*: Levin, Aryeh. "Sibawayhi". In: Aurox, S. et al. (eds.). *History of the language sciences* I (2000). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 252–263.
- , *Spoken*: Levin, Aryeh. "Sibawayhi's attitude to the spoken language". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XVII (1994). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 204–243. Reprinted in Levin, *Linguistic*, article XII.
- , *Taqdīr*: Levin, Aryeh. "The theory of *al-taqdīr* and its terminology". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XXI (1997). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 142–166.
- , *Two passages*: Levin, Aryeh. "An interpretation of two difficult passages from *al-Kitāb* referring to the *ʿamil* in elliptical sentences". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*

- XXXI (2006). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 107–117.
- Lipiński, *Grammar*: Lipiński, Edward. *Semitic languages: Outline of a comparative grammar*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters En Departement Oosterse Studies, 1997.
- Lucius, *Grammatica*: Lucius, Emonis. *Emonis Lucii Vriemot Arabismus; Exhibens Grammaticam Arabicam Novam & Monumenta quaedam Arabica, cum Notis Miscellaneis & Glossario Arabico-Latino*. Franequerae: V. Bleck, 1733.
- Maw'id, *al-Anbārī*: Maw'id, Muḥammad 'Aṭā. *Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim al-Anbārī wajuhūduhu fī l-naḥw wal-ṣarf wal-luḡa*. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 2000.
- al-Maxzūmī, *Kūfa*: al-Maxzūmī, Maḥdī. *Madrasat al-Kūfa wamanhajuhā fī dirāsāt al-luḡa wal-naḥw*. Abu Dhabi: al-Majma' al-Taḡāfi, 2002.
- , *Qaḍāyā*: al-Maxzūmī, Maḥdī. *Qaḍāyā naḥwiyya*. Abu Dhabi: al-Majma' al-Taḡāfi, 2002.
- Michaelis, *Grammatik*: Michaelis, Johann David. *Arabische Grammatik nebst einer arabischen Chrestomathie, und Abhandlung vom arabischen Geschmack*. 2nd edition. Göttingen: Victorinus Bosiegel, 1781.
- Mosel, *Sibawayhi*: Mosel, Ulrike. *Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sibawaihi*. Munich: Uni Fotodruck Frank, 1975. 2 vols.
- Muftī, *Qurra'*: Muftī, Xadija Aḥmad. *Naḥw al-qurrā' al-kūfiyyīna*. Mecca: al-Maktaba l-Fayṣaliyya, 1406/1985.
- Mus'id, *Masā'il*: Mus'id, 'Abd al-Mun'im Fā'iz. *Masā'il fī l-naḥw wal-ṣarf*. [Jerusalem]: Jami'at al-Quds, 1411/1990.
- , *Naḥw*: Mus'id, 'Abd al-Mun'im Fā'iz. *Al-Ḥujja fī l-naḥw*. Jerusalem: Maṭba'at Rawān al-Tijāriyya, 1407/1987.
- Nāji, *al-'Aḥjār*: Nāji, Hilāl. *Kitāb al-'aḥjār šana'ahu l-ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād 326–385 hijra*. In: *Majallat Majma' al-Luḡa l-'Arabiyya biDimašq* LXXXII/2 (2007). Damascus: Majma' al-Luḡa l-'Arabiyya. pp. 1–29.
- Nöldeke, *Belegwörterbuch*: Nöldeke, Theodor. *Belegwörterbuch zur klassischen arabischen Sprache*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1952–1954. 2 vols.
- , *Grammatik*: Nöldeke, Theodor. *Zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch, Im Anhang: Die Handschriftlichen Ergänzungen in dem Handexemplar Theodor Nöldekes bearbeitet und mit Zusätzen versehen von Anton Spitaler*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
- Owens, *Foundations*: Owens, Jonatahan. *The foundations of grammar*. Studies in the history of the language sciences XLV. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1988.
- , *Grammatical theory*: Owens, Jonatahan. *Early Arabic grammatical theory*. Studies in the history of the language sciences LIII. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1990.
- Peled, *Conditional*: Peled, Yishai. "Conditional sentences without a conditional particle in Classical Arabic prose". In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* XVI (1987). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 31–43.
- Qaddāra, *Masā'il*: Qaddāra, Faxr Ṣāliḥ Sulaymān. *Masā'il xilāfiyya bayn al-Xalīl waSibawayhi*. Amman: Dār al-Amal, 1990.
- Rabin, *West-Arabian*: Rabin, Chaim. *Ancient West-Arabian*. London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951.
- Reckendorf, *Syntax*: Reckendorf, Hermann. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1921.
- , *Verhältnisse*: Reckendorf, Hermann. *Die Syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1898.
- Reuschel, *al-Xalīl*: Reuschel, Wolfgang. *Al-Ḥalīl Ibn-Aḥmad, der Lehrer Sibawaihs, als Grammatiker*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959.
- Sadan, *Ḥattā*: Sadan, Arik. "The mood of the verb following ḥattā, according to medieval Arab grammarians". In: Marogy, Amal E. (ed.). *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics: Sibawayhi and Early Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics LXV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2012. pp. 173–186.

- , *Jawāb*: Sadan, Arik. "The meaning of the technical term *jawāb* in Arabic grammar". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XXXVII (2010). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 129–137.
- , *Subjonctif*: Sadan, Arik. « Le subjonctif en arabe classique et en français : des similitudes intéressantes ». In: Baumgarten, Jean et al. (eds.). *Actes du colloque en mémoire de Sophie Kessler-Mesguich. Études juives, linguistique hébraïque, linguistique sémitique*. Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2012. pp. 293–304.
- , *Xiffa*: Sadan, Arik. "The technical terms *Ḥiffa* and *Tiqal* in the usage of the Arabic grammarians". In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* XLVIII (2008). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 58–74.
- al-Šā'ir, *Šawāhid*: al-Šā'ir, Hasan Mūsā. *Ixtilāf al-riwāya fi šawāhid Sibawayhi l-ši'riyya*. Amman: Dār al-Bašir, 1413/1992.
- al-Sāmarrā'i, *Ma'āni*: al-Sāmarrā'i, Fāḍil Šāliḥ. *Ma'āni l-naḥw*. Amman: Dār al-Fikr, 1420/2000. 4 vols.
- Sezgin, GAS: Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967–1984. 10 vols.
- al-Šinqīṭī, *Durar*: al-Šinqīṭī, Aḥmad b. al-Amīn. *Al-Durar al-lawāmi' 'alā ham' al-hawāmi' šarḥ jam' al-jawāmi'*. Ed. Muḥammad Bāsil 'Uyūn al-Sūd. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1419/1999. 3 vols.
- Spitta, *Grammatik*: Spitta, Wilhelm. *Grammatik des arabischen Vulgärdialectes von Aegypten*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1880.
- Tahānawī, *Kaššāf*: Tahānawī, Muḥammad A'lā. *Kaššāf ištīlāḥāt al-funūn*. Ed. Luṭfi 'Abd al-Badī'. Calcutta: [Asiatic Society of Bengal], 1862. 2 vols.
- Talmon, *Ḥattā*: Talmon, Rafael. "*Ḥattā* + Imperfect and chapter 239 in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*: A study in the early history of Arabic Grammar". In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* XXXVIII (1993). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 71–95.
- , *Iraqi grammar*: Talmon, Rafael. *Eighth century Iraqi grammar: A critical exploration of pre-Ḥalīlian Arabic linguistics*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Tawāma, *Zaman*: Tawāma, 'Abd al-Jabbār. *Zaman al-fi'l fi l-luḡa l-'arabiyya qarā'inuhu wajihātuhu*. Algiers: Dīwān al-Maṭbū'āt al-Jāmi'iyya, 1994.
- Troupeau, *Lexique*: Troupeau, Gérard. *Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sibawayhi*. Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1976.
- Trumpp, *Bedingungssatz*: Trumpp, Ernst. *Der Bedingungssatz im Arabischen*. Munich: Akademische Buchdruckerei F. Straub, 1882.
- , *Einleitung*: Trumpp, Ernst. *Einleitung in das Studium der arabischen Grammatiker: die Ajrūmiyyah [sic] des Muḥammad bin Daūd: Arabischer text mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen von Ernst Trumpp*. Munich: Verlag der K. Akademie, 1876.
- Ullmann, *Asā*: Ullmann, Manfred. *Arabisch 'asā "vielleicht"*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984.
- , *WKAS*: Ullmann, Manfred (ed.). *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache, unter Mitwirkung der Akademien der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Heidelberg und München und der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970–2004. (Bd. 1–2/Lfg. 1–38)
- Vernier, *Grammaire*: Vernier, Donat S. J. *Grammaire arabe composée d'après les sources primitives*. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1891–1892. 2 vols.
- Versteegh, *Grammar*: Versteegh, C. H. M. *Arabic grammar and Qur'ānic exegesis in early Islam*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics XIX. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- , *Review*: Versteegh, C. H. M. "Review of Talmon, *Iraqi grammar*". In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* XXX (2005). The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies. pp. 528–535.
- , *Syntactic position*: Versteegh, C. H. M. "The Arabic terminology of syntactic position". In: *Arabica* XXV/3 (1978). Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 261–281.
- Wild, *Ḥattā*: Wild, Stefan. "Die Konjunktion *ḥattā* mit dem Indikativ Imperfekt im klassischen Arabisch". In: Diem, Werner et al. (eds.). *Studien aus Arabistik und Semitistik*.

- Anton Spitaler zum siebzigsten Geburtstag von seinen Schülern überreicht.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980. pp. 204–223.
- Wright, *Grammar*: Wright, William. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 2 vols.
- Ya'qūb, *Daqā'iq*: Ya'qūb, Imil Badī'. *Al-Mu'jam al-mufaṣṣal fī daqā'iq al-luġa l-'arabiyya.* Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1424/2004.
- , *Ḥurūf*: Ya'qūb, Imil Badī'. *Mawsū'at al-ḥurūf fī l-luġa l-'arabiyya.* Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1415/1995.
- , *Šawāhid*: Ya'qūb, Imil Badī'. *Al-Mu'jam al-mufaṣṣal fī šawāhid al-naḥw al-šī'riyya.* Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1413/1992. 3 vols.

INDICES

INDEX OF NAMES¹

- Aartun, Kjell 43, 44, 58, 87, 296n11
‘Abdallāh b. Abi Ishāq (d. 117/735 or 127/745) 180, 209, 342
‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar (d. 73/693) 48
Abū ‘Amr b. al-‘Alā’ (d. 154/771) 342
Abū l-Hayjā’, Aḥmad 330n48
Abū Ḥayyān (d. 745/1344) 8, 10n40, 28n97, 32n113, 33–34, 42, 56–57, 64, 70, 73–74, 123–124, 128, 143n58, 152n96, 157n117, 185, 189, 206n45, 208n50, 210n62, 216, 241, 243, 254–255, 261n62, 265, 283, 284, 287, 290, 292, **319**
Abū Ḥizām al-‘Uklī 264
Abū Muḥammad Yahyā b. al-Mubārak al-Yazīdī 6n22
Abū ‘Ubayda (d. 207/822 or 213/828) 8, 47
Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī (d. 214/830 or 215/831) 265
al-‘Alā’ b. Siyāba (d. second/eighth century) 152, 295n6
‘Alqama 300
al-Anṣārī, Aḥmad Makkī 289n13
Arabia 15
Arabic
Ancient South 44
Modern 281, 282n45, 296n11
post-classical 76, 219n11
pre-classical 13, 14, 293
Aramaic 44, 87n33
Arberry, Arthur xxn37
al-Ardabīlī (d. 1036/1626) **320**
al-Aṣma‘ī (d. 213/828) 180n28, 281
al-Astarābādī (d. 684/1285 or 686/1288) 10, 28, 30–31, 39, 42, 70, 73n59, 82, 84, 85, 89–91, 99, 101, 104, 105–106, 120, 123–124, 147n74, 155, 163, 164, 180n26, 210, 211, 223–225, 243n206, 244, 246, 265, 267, 270, 283–285, 292, 294, **320**
al-Axfaṣ al-Awsaṭ (d. between 210–221/825–835) 30–32, 42, 46, 70, 71, 73n62, 99–100, 124, 148n81, 154, 162, 167, 242, 243n206, 257, 262, 264–265, 276–277, **320**
al-Axfaṣ al-Kabīr, Abū l-Xaṭṭāb (d. 157/773–4) 342
al-‘Aynī (d. 855/1451) 182n35, **321**
Ayoub, Georgine 303
al-Azhārī (later grammarian, d. 905/1499) **321**
al-Azhārī (lexicographer, d. 370/980) 118, 199, 200, 253n20, 264, **321**
Baalbaki, Ramzi 76–77, 128, 131n10, 141n52, 143n57, 145n65, 145n68, 156n114, 159, 170, 173n, 174, 190–191, 292
al-Baġdādī (d. 1093/1682) 277n22, **322**
Baghdad/Baghdadian/*baġdādiyy* pl. *baġādida*, *baġdādiyyūna* 28, 314
Banū l-‘Anbar 264–266
Banū Asad 277n22
Banū Ḥanīfa 8n29
Banū Ṣabāḥ 8
Banū Tamīm 160, 167–168, 264, 266
Banū ‘Ukl 265, 266

¹ Entries of primary sources are arranged according to the person's familiar name used throughout the book; information on Ibn Jinnī, for example, is given under the entry “Ibn Jinnī” and not under “‘Uṭmān Abū l-Faṭḥ” (the full names of grammarians and lexicographers are given in appendix B). No entries are given to grammarians' book titles, unless these books do not appear in the bibliography; information relevant to grammarians' books is provided under the grammarians' names.

Bibliographic references appearing in the footnotes without additional information are disregarded in this index.

Numerals in bold refer to pages in appendix B where the primary source's biographical details and authored books are detailed.

- Başra/Başran/*başriyy* pl. *başriyyūna* xiii,
xiv, 10, 57, 64, 66–67, 69–70, 74–77, 80,
81, 121, 123, 154, 157, 169, 170, 176, 194, 198,
238–242, 266–270, 279–280, 290, 294,
314, 315
non-Başran 26n90, 278
al-Baṭalyawsī (d. 521/1127) 134, 189,
229–230, **322**
Beck, P. Edmund 80, 92, 95, 97
Blachère, Régis 12n48, 87, 108
Brockelmann, Carl 60, 73n60, 73n61,
116n21, 217, 218, 220, 254n31, 260, 320,
342n96
al-Bustānī (d. 1300/1883) 82, 108, **322**
al-Buxārī (d. 256/870) 170n181, 330

Carter, Michael G. 174, 310–311, 313n78,
315, 317

al-Ḍarīr al-Wāsiṭī (d. ca. 430/1038) 155,
216, 222, 309–310, **322–323**
de Sacy, M. Le Baron Silvestre 11n46,
83–86, 108–109, 158, 190, 200, 218, 219,
320
Dévényi, Kinga 128
Dirah, al-Muxtār 274n14, 275n17, 317n103
Du'āb al-Asadī 179

Egypt 281
Erpenius, Thomas 82n12
Ethiopic 15, 50, 76, 79n1

al-Fākihī (d. 972/1565) 223n126, **323**
Falj 264–265
al-Fārisī (d. 377/987) 111, 8, 49, 66,
71, 73n62, 75, 82, 90, 111n, 133n17, 154,
160n130, 160n132, 163, 205n38, 214,
228–229, 235n173, 238, 239, 253n20,
260n57, 278, 316, **323–324**
al-Farrā' (d. 207/822) *passim*
Faxr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) 346
al-Fayyūmī (d. after 770/1368) 89, **324**
al-Fihri (d. 570/1174–5) 254n29
Firtāj 144
al-Firūzābādī (d. 817/1415) **324**
Fischer, Wolfdietrich 12–14, 34, 76,
217–218, 219n111, 248, 293
Fleisch, Henri 2n5, 15–16, 158–159,
281n40, 281n42, 281n43, 282n45
Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht 11–12,
42–43, 53, 83, 84, 86, 90n43, 103n105, 104,
107–109, 120n37, 158, 190, 200, 201n22,
218–220, 248, 259–260, 293
French xin3, 296n12

Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Maurice 12n48,
87, 108
Ġazlān, 'Abdallāh 198, 203n29
al-Gazzālī 324
German 79n1, 259–260

Ḥājji Xalīfa 320, 340n87, 342n97
al-Harawī (d. ca. 410/1019) 3, 26n90, 28,
213, **325**
al-Ḥarīrī (d. 516/1122) 30, 71, 154, 157–158,
212, 251, **325**
Hārūn al-Qārī' (d. 170/786) 342
Ḥasan, 'Abbās 30n104, 44, 55n78, 82n15,
87, 128, 174, 225–226
Hava, J. G. 2n3
Hebrew 43n23, 60, 79n1
Hegazi, Mahmoud M. F. 239n194
Ḥijāz 14, 160, 209n54, 281
al-Ḥimyarī (d. ca. 573/1178) 82, 134n21,
325
Hišām b. Mu'āwiya (d. 209/824) 40n12,
64, 99, 243, 280, **325**
Holes, Clive 296n11
Howell, Mortimer Sloper 103n107, 302n22

Ibn Abī Rabi' (d. 688/1289) **326**
Ibn Ājurriūm (d. 723/1323) 323
Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū Bakr (d.
328/940) 274n11, 317n103
Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū l-Barakāt (d.
577/1181) 10, 31n107, 47, 66–67, 69–70,
75–77, 100, 102n103, 170, 194, 239–240,
242, 267–269, 278n28, 279–280, **326**
Ibn 'Aqīl (d. 769/1367) 7n24, 64n23,
68n34, 143n58, 210n61, 222n121, 243,
289n13, 290, **326–327**
Ibn Aṭīr 281
Ibn Bābašād (d. 469/1077) 99, **327**
Ibn Barī (d. 582/1187) **327**
Ibn Burhān al-Ukbarī (d.
456/1063–1064) 120, 154, **327**
Ibn El Farouk, Abdelhamid xin3, xviin31
Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1004) 42, 156, 251,
253n20, **327**
Ibn al-Ḥājib (d. 646/1249) 39, 41, 67, 70,
77, 85, 89, 137n35, 155, 211n67, 222–223,
233–234, 244, 270n108, 292, **328**
Ibn Hišām (d. 761/1360) 28n98, 46,
48–49, 53n69, 55–56, 69, 82n15, 83–85,
90, 91, 99, 128n3, 134n22, 173n, 174,
176n12, 177, 185n53, 269, 283, 288,
289n13, **328–329**
Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002) 7n27, 10, 11, 33,
56–57, 85, 128, 155, 164n151, 169, 213, 253,

- 264, 265, 278–279, 292, 300n14, 307, 314, 317n102, **329**
- Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1274) xii, 7, 8, 10n40, 15, 31, 48, 64, 68, 99, 103n109, 105n112, 116–117, 120–121, 123–124, 128, 136n29, 155–156, 163, 177, 185, 210, 222n121, 225n129, 266, 269, 283, 286–287, 302–303, **329–330**
- Ibn Manzūr (d. 711/1311–1312) 147n74, **330**
- Ibn Mas'ūd (d. 32/652–3) 103n107, 103n109
- Ibn Mu'ī (d. 628/1231) 155, **330**
- Ibn al-Nāẓim (d. 686/1287) 210n61, 225n129, **331**
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) 45, 49, **336**
- Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) 213, **331**
- Ibn Rušd (d. 595/1198) 251, **331**
- Ibn al-Šajārī l-Baġdādī (d. 542/1148) **331**
- Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/929) 29, 32, 33, 67, 77, 82, 98n80, 100, 105, 118, 124, 131, 133, 134n26, 147n74, 154, 157, 163–164, 166, 169, 173n, 178n17, 184n42, 188, 192, 193, 233, 238, 242, 301–302, 314, **332**
- Ibn Sida (Siduh) (d. 458/1066) 47, 81, 112n1, 154, **332**
- Ibn Šuqayr (d. 317/929 or 315/927) 7, 46–47, 253n21, 257, 262, 263, 270, **332**
- Ibn al-Ṭarāwa (d. 528/1133–1134) **333**
- Ibn 'Uṣfūr (d. 670/1271) 55–57, 99, 119n31, 128, 138n36, 156, 205n42, 215–216, 263, 290, **333**
- Ibn al-Wardī (d. 749/1349) **333**
- Ibn al-Xabbāz (d. 637/1240 or 639/1242) 5–6, 52, **333–334**
- Ibn Xallikān (d. 681/1282) 334
- Ibn Xarūf (d. between 606–610/1209–1213) 73–75, 260n58, 273n7, **334**
- Ibn al-Xaššāb (d. 567/1172) **334**
- Ibn Ya'īš (d. 643/1245) 39, 46, 52–53, 61n8, 67, 85, 100, 103n109, 116, 118n29, 119–120, 169, 182n35, 201n21, 212, 222, 317n102, **334**
- al-Irbilī (d. 631/1234 or later) 8n29, **334**
- ʿIsā b. ʿUmar al-Ṭaqafī (d. 149/766) 105, **335**
- Jahn, Gustav 23, 112n4, 117, 140n45, 141n52, 143n56, 148n79, 178n19, 180n26, 181n30, 186, 187n61, 203n31, 227n144, 281
- al-Jāmī (d. 898/1492) **335**
- al-Jarmī (d. 225/839) 121, 123, 169, 194, 216, **335**
- al-Jawālīqī 7
- al-Jawharī (d. between 393–400/1002–1010) 89, **335**
- al-Jurjānī, ʿAbd al-Qāhir (d. 471/1078) 18n66, 27, 52, 60n3, 61n5, 156, 167, 211–212, 221, 253n20, 256, **336**
- K. al-'Aġānī* (Abū l-Faraj al-Iṣbahānī) 72
- K. al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ* (Abū Ḥayyān) 311n1, 261n62
- K. al-Farx* (al-Jarmī) 216
- K. al-Faṣīḥ* (Ṭa'lab) 277n22, 348
- K. al-Ḥamāsa* 68n37, 87n32
- K. al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ* (al-Buxārī) 330
- K. al-Kāmil* (al-Mubarrad) 87n32
- K. al-Kaššāf 'an ḥaqā'iq al-tanzīl* (al-Zamaxšarī) 103n107
- K. al-Muqarrib fi l-naḥw* (al-Fihri) 254n29
- K. al-Nawādir* (al-Liḥyānī) 263n72
- K. al-Qaṣā'id al-sab' al-jāhiliyyāt* (Ibn al-Anbārī, Abū Bakr) 274n11
- K. Šarḥ al-Wajīz* (al-Rāfi'i) 324
- K. al-Taṣrīf* (al-Māzinī) 337
- K. al-Wajīz* (al-Ġazzālī) 324
- al-Kaffawī (d. 1094/1684) **336**
- Kalbī 264
- Kinberg, Naphtali 80, 206n42
- al-Kisā'ī (d. 189/805) 7, 40, 42, 48, 57, 64, 74, 75, 77, 99, 119, 121, 123, 147n74, 151n95, 155, 165n158, 169, 194, 206, 207, 209, 233, 239, 261n62, 264, 265, 277n22, 280, 281, **337**
- Kosegarten, Joan. Godofr. Lud. 174
- Kūfa/Kūfan/kūfiyy pl. *kūfiyyūna* xiv, xviii28, 7, 8, 10, 25n89, 34, 64, 66–67, 69, 75–77, 80, 81, 121, 123, 147n74, 154, 157, 163, 169, 170, 174, 176, 194, 208n50, 215, 238–242, 259, 266–270, 278–280, 288, 290, 294, 314, 315, 317n103
- non-Kūfan 77
- Kulayb 217
- Lane, Edward William 2n3, 7n25, 9n35, 14n57, 53n69, 143n58, 183n40, 189n79, 201n21, 201n22, 204n36, 289n15, 302n22, 303n26, 306n37, 316n97
- al-Layṭ b. al-Muzaḥḥar (d. second/eighth century) 199n9, 345
- Levin, Aryeh 130n9, 199n14, 201n21, 237n182, 310–311, 316n96
- al-Liḥyānī 8, 15, 47, 263n72, 281
- Lipiński, Edward 15n59, 43, 49–50, 51n63, 218, 247–248

- Ma'add 277
 al-Madīna 209
 Makkī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 437/1045) 265
 al-Makkūdī (d. 807/1405) 337
 al-Mālaqī (d. 702/1302–1303) 134n24, 299n9, 337
 Maw'id, Muḥammad 'Atā 317n103
 al-Maxzūmī, Mahdī 317n103
 al-Mazīnī (d. between 247–249/861–863) 32, 49, 337
 Mecca 6n22, 290
 Mosel, Ulrike 201n22
 Mu'ād al-Harrā' (d. 187/802) 152
mu'aydiy 277
 al-Mubarrad (d. 286/900 or 285/899) 6, 20n73, 28, 30–33, 76, 87n32, 100, 103n109, 115–116, 131, 134n26, 138n37, 143n57, 175n7, 238, 250, 253, 262n66, 277–278, 307, 309, 310n57, 338
 Mujāhid (d. 104/722) 209
 Mujāshī' 217
 al-Murādī (d. 749/1348) 255n35, 338
 Mus'id, 'Abd al-Mun'im Fa'iz 47n39
 al-Muṭarrizī (d. 610/1213) 338
- al-Naḍr b. Šumayl (d. 203/818 or 204/819) 176n9, 250n7, 253n20, 338
 Nāfi' 209
 al-Naḥḥās (d. 338/950) 25n89, 31, 47, 152n96, 154, 157, 167–168, 174n2, 259, 262, 265, 275n17, 339
 Nahšal 217
 Nāji, Hilāl 340n87
 Nöldeke, Theodor 48n47, 72, 84n22, 90n43, 274n12
- Qaddāra, Faxr Šāliḥ Sulaymān 44–45
 Qays 141, 277n22
 Quḍā'a 7, 264
 Quṭrub 278
- Rabī'a 264
 Rabin, Chaim 7n23, 14–15, 50, 281–282
 al-Rāfi'ī (d. 623/1226) 324
 Reckendorf, Hermann 12n49, 13n55, 19n70, 43, 71n50, 72, 73n60, 73n61, 76, 84n22, 85–87, 170n181, 217–218, 220, 225, 248, 274n12, 281, 296n11
 Reuschel, Wolfgang 146n73
 Rizām 300
 Romance languages xi, 295–296
 al-Ru'āsī (d. second/eighth century) 7, 8n32, 15, 339
 al-Ru'aynī (d. 954/1547) 323
- al-Rummānī (d. 384/994) 46, 75, 81, 133, 177n13, 259, 310n61, 339–340
- Sa'd 140, 141n49
 Sadan, Arik xin3, 1n2, 8n27, 197n, 296n12
 al-Šāfi'ī 281
 al-Šāgānī (d. 650/1252) 39, 51, 340
 al-Šāḥib Ibn 'Abbād (d. 385/995) 340
 al-Šā'ir, Ḥasan Mūsā 274n11
 Šalāḥ al-Dīn b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Abī l-Qāsim (d. 849/1445–1446) 7n24, 137n31, 340
 al-Šalawbīn (d. 645/1247) 90, 340
 Salma 7
 al-Šamarrā'ī, Faḍil Šāliḥ 55n77, 200, 225n130
 al-Šan'ānī (d. before 709/1309–1310) 1n1, 59n, 253n25, 341
 al-Šantamarī (d. 476/1083) 75, 114n12, 119, 138n38, 140n45, 141n49, 182n35, 272n2, 290, 341
 al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413) 9n36, 341
 al-Šarīf al-Kūfi (d. 539/1145) 112n4, 341–342
 al-Saxāwī (d. 643/1245–1246) 5–6, 26n90, 46n36, 53–54, 253, 342
 al-Šaymarī (d. 541/1146–1147 or fourth/tenth century) 251, 342
- School
 Bašran see Bašra
 Kūfan see Kūfa
 Old Iraqi 294–295
 Semitic languages 16, 43n23, 44, 58, 76, 87n33, 217
 Old 282n45
 Western 15
 Sezgin, Fuat 325n26
 Sibawayhi (d. ca. 180/796) *passim*
 al-Šinqīṭī, Aḥmad b. al-Amin 141n52
 al-Sīrāfi, Abū Muḥammad (d. 385/995) 113n12, 142n55, 144n61, 214, 272n2, 343
 al-Sīrāfi, Abū Sa'id (d. 368/979) 3n6, 9–10, 19n71, 23, 39–41, 46, 66, 131, 138n38, 169, 180n28, 188, 227n144, 228–230, 232n161, 235n175, 239n194, 343
 al-Širbīnī (d. 977/1570) 343
 Spitta, Wilhelm 281
 Subay' 300
 al-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185) 47–48, 54–55, 251, 253–254, 258, 292, 343
 al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) 6n22, 7n24, 10, 49n50, 51, 68n37, 69n43, 80n4, 82, 91,

- 103n104, 105n112, 108, 123–124, 143n58,
169n179, 177, 182n35, 210n61, 216,
240–244, 266, 292, **343–344**
- al-Ṭabarī 71n50, 170n181, 198n5, 209n53
Ta'lab (d. 291/904) 9, 64, 70–71, 74–75,
277n22, 278, **344**
- Talmon, Rafael 198, 201n22, 209n53,
222n119, 226, 227n144, 228n147, 230–232,
294–295
- Tamīm 69, 141. See also Banū Tamīm.
- Tawāma, 'Abd al-Jabbār 58
- al-Tawzī (d. 233/847–8) 274n11
- Trumpf, Ernst 79n1, 165n158, 201n22
- Tumānī 264–265
- Ubayy b. Ka'b (d. between 19/640 and
35/656) 103n109
- Ugaritic 44, 87n33
- al-'Ukbarī (d. ca. 616/1219) 85, 98, 155,
167, 188–189, 212, **344–345**
- Ullmann, Manfred 48n47, 73n60, 260
- al-Uṣmūnī (d. ca. 900/1495) **345**
- Vernier, Donat S. J. 30n104, 201n22, 225
- Versteegh, C. H. M. 178n19, 315n92
- al-Warrāq (d. 381/991) **345**
- Wild, Stefan 198, 209n53, 219n111, 235n175
- Wright, William 2n3, 72, 112n4, 164n152,
165n155, 188n72, 207n47, 214n85,
237n184, 255n37, 280
- Xalaf al-Aḥmar (d. ca. 180/796) 264, 265
- al-Xalīl b. Aḥmad (d. 175/791, or 170/786,
or 160/776) 38–42, 50–52, 72, 74, 77,
81, 83, 85, 88–90, 93, 101–102, 106,
118–119, 146, 199n9, 202, 235, 259,
260n57, 294–295, 300, 304, 311n63,
317n103, **345**
- al-Xwārazmī, Abū 'Abdallāh (d. ca.
380/990–991) 236, **345**
- al-Xwārazmī, Šadr al-Afāḍil (d.
617/1220) 221, **346**
- Ya'qūb, Imīl Badī' 82
- Yāqūt al-Rūmī (d. 626/1229) 334
- Yāsīn al-Zayyāt 6n22
- Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (d. ca. 182 or 183/798 or
799) 94, 105, 216, 264, **346**
- al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1791) 281n42, **346**
- al-Zajjāj (d. 311/923) 102, 118, 211–212, 214,
224n127, 257, 258, 277, **346–347**
- al-Zajjājī (d. between
337–340/948–950) 6, 27–28, 75, 101,
154, 166, 211, 231, 233, 236, 250, 251, 255,
258–259, 262, 264n75, 266–267, **347**
- al-Zamaxšarī (d. 538/1144) 27, 29n100,
33n117, 52–53, 82, 85, 103n107, 118n29,
167, 222–223, 233, 244, **347–348**
- al-Zibriqān 140, 141n49
- Zubāla 206
- al-Zubaydī l-Iṣbīlī (d. 379/989) 176n9,
348

INDEX OF TERMS¹

- action
 durative 205, 207
 non-durative 206, 215
 gradual 120, 243–244
 hypothetical xi, 14, 30, 31, 148, 150, 170, 219n11, 221, 224, 295–296
 in the future 2, 5, 26, 34, 39, 46, 50–51, 55n78, 62, 89, 95, 98, 158, 202, 206–208, 211–212, 220–226, 241, 244–246, 261–262
 in the past see action: realized
 in the present 10, 55n78, 62, 90, 95, 100–101, 204, 214, 221, 245–246
 realized, occurring in reality, certain 6, 14–15, 20–24, 29n100, 30, 32, 51n63, 89, 148, 154, 159, 161, 203–204, 206–207, 211–216, 219–226, 231, 236, 245–247, 262, 295–296
 non-realized see action: hypothetical, uncertain
 uncertain 15, 22, 28, 29n100, 77, 202, 223, 234–236, 246–247
 ‘*ad/adi* 217
 ‘*afāl*
 al-muqāraba 2, 28n39
 al-qulūb see ‘*afāl al-šakk wal-yaqīn*
 al-šakk wal-yaqīn 79n2, 92, 95–96, 98, 148, 229
 See also *fi’l*.
 ‘*amal* (syntactic effect) 75, 128, 299n8
 ‘*amal* (theory) 1n1, 294, **297–298**
 ‘*amil* pl. ‘*awāmil* xi, xvii, 1n1, 3, 27, 30, 38, 61–62, 65–67, 70, 89, 91, 102, 103n104, 104–109, 113, 129–131, 135–136, 146, 170, 194, 203n31, 204n37, 222, 229, 234, 239–241, 266–268, 270, 277, 280, 284, 286, **297–298**, 299, 303–304, 306n36, 307–308, 314
 ‘*amil lafẓiyy* pl. ‘*awāmil lafẓiyya* 95, 298, 304, 311–312, 314
 al-‘amil lahu xtišās 67, 72, 122, 239–241, 266, **298**, 304
 ‘*amil ma’nawiyy* pl. ‘*awāmil ma’nawiyya* 204n37, 298, 312, 314
 ‘*amr* 153–156. See also *jawāb al-‘amr*, *li- (lām al-‘amr)*.
 ‘*an*
 bima’nā ‘ay see ‘*an al-mufasssira laǧwan* see ‘*an al-zā’ida*
 al-mašdariyya see ‘*an al-nāšiba muḍmara* (concealed) xvii–xviii, 50, 59, 65–66, 69, 77, 79, 84, 101–102, 106–107, 121–124, 127–129, 135–136, 160–161, 168, 170–171, 173, 175–178, 183, 192–193, 195, 198, 202, 221, 224, 234, 238–241, 247, 249, 263, 265–271, 278, 280, 298–302, **303–304**, 305n32, 315–316
 al-mufasssira 1, 34n123
 al-muxaffāfa (followed by *raf*) 2, 9–10, 12, 15–23, 27–32, 34–35
 muḡhara (overt) 169, 193, 238, 268, 299–300, 304
 al-nāšiba (followed by *našb*) 1, 4, 5, 10, 16–18, 27–30, 34–35
 omission of 14–15, 271–282
 wa’axawātuhā (and its sisters) 7, 46, 84, 95
 al-xaffifa (followed by *jazm*) 6–8
 al-xaffifa (followed by *našb*) 1, 3n6, 5–8, 11, 29–30, 34
 al-xaffifa (followed by *raf*) 6–11
 al-zā’ida 2, 34n123
 ‘*anna* 2, 4–5, 9, 11–34 *passim*, 57n85, 205n38, 293
 apodosis 57, 91n49, 93–94, 97, 133, 154, 242–243, 283–284, 287, 310–311. See also *jawāb al-šarṭ*.
 ‘*ard* 153–156, 164, 185
 ‘*asā* 2, 273
 ‘*aṣl* (basis, base/basic form) 39, 41, 43–44, 51, 241, 265, 284–285
 ‘*aṣl* (root) 85n25
 ‘*atf* 111, 114, 127, 152, 173, 182, **299–303**, 310, 314. See also *ḥarf ‘atf*, *wa- (wāw al-‘atf)*.
 ‘*aw*
 followed by *našb* 111–125 *passim*
 followed by *raf* 113–117

¹ Numerals in bold refer to pages in appendix A where the term is defined and discussed.

badal (replacement) 279–280
basīṭ (simple, independent, not compound) 38, 41, 44, 58, 83, 85, 87–88
 Bedouins speech, spoken language 8–9, 22, 26, 40, 47, 64n23, 68n34, 70, 105, 121, 186n53, 216, 227, 261, 265, 282, 312
binā' xi

circumstantial clause see *ḥāl*
 compensation see *ʿiwad*

al-dā'im (present) 51
ḍamma 7n27
ḍarurat al-šī'r see poetic license
 dialect, dialectal differences, dialectal variety 8, 9, 11, 12, 14–16, 35, 45, 48–50, 59n, 104–107, 167, 216, 247, 263–264, 281–282, 291–292
du'ā' 18, 23, 32–33, 99, 151, 153–156, 185

'eska 217
 etymology
 of *ḥattā* 199–200, 217
 of *'idā* 79n1
 of *'idan* 80, 84–88, 107–109
 of *lan* 3, 38–46, 57
 exceptional usage see *šādd*

fa-
 (*fā' al-jawāb*) 133
 (*fā' al-jazā'*) 133–134
 (*fā' al-sabab*) 133n16, 134
 (*fā' al-sababiyya*) 133–134
fā' see under *fa-*
 fact see action: realized
far' (derivation, derived form) 41, 241
faṣīḥ pl. *fuṣṣahā'*; *'afṣaḥ* 7, 106, 277n22
fathā 11, 249, 263–265
fi'l pl. *'af'āl* 4–5, 164, 201n21, 251, 258, 286, 314, 316n97, 317. See also *'af'āl, ism fi'l, muḍārī'*.
 free *naṣb* xvii–xviii, 14–15, 271–282
 future see under action, time
ḡāya 200–202, 215, 216n95, 244. See also *terminus ad quem*.

ḥadd al-kalām 139n40
 Hadīṭ tradition xii, 48–49, 217n100, 258
ḥāl 131n12, 187–189, 219–220. See also *ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiyya*.
han 43
ḥarf pl. *ḥurūf, 'aḥruf* 1n1, 3n6, 83–84, 89, 297, 306n37, 317
ḥarf 'atf pl. *ḥurūf 'atf* 310n57

ḥarf ibtidā' pl. *ḥurūf ibtidā'* 72, 203–205, 247
ḥarf iḥtiqār 235
ḥarf iḥtiṣār 235n175
ḥarf 'i'rāb 146, 297, 311–312. See also *'i'rāb*.
ḥarf jahd 253n21
ḥarf jarr pl. *ḥurūf jarr* xviin32, 2, 65–68, 71–72, 77, 198, 202n25, 205n38, 234, 238n190, 240–242, 244, 247, 253, 265, 268, 270n108
ḥarf maṣḍariyy 68. See also *'an al-nāṣiba, mā al-maṣḍariyya*.
ḥarf naḡy 270n108
ḥarf naṣb pl. *ḥurūf naṣb* 65–68, 77, 241
ḥarf nasq pl. *ḥurūf nasq* 96
ḥarf ta'līl 61n5
ḥattā
 al-'ātifa 205n38
 (meaning of *'aw/ḥattā*) 115–122
 passim, 124
 See also etymology of *ḥattā*.
ḥikāya 6
ḥikāyat al-ḥāl al-māḍiyya 214, 219–222, 246
 historical development 11–13, 35, 44, 89, 104–107, 247, 291–296
al-ibtidā' (*'āmil*) 95, 203n31, 204n37, 306n36, 314n89. See also *ḥarf ibtidā'*.
ibtidā' (beginning of a new utterance, synonym of *inḡitā'*) 273, 283, 306, 307
'idāfa 200, 265. See also *li- (lām al-'idāfa)*.
'idan
 etymology of see etymology of *'idan*
 orthography of see orthography of *'idan*
'idmār 121, 129, 240, 303, 315. See also *muḍmar*.
'illa 61, 251
'illa 19–20, 30, 137–140, 155, 161, 163, 255, 317n103
'illa 'an (meaning of *'aw/ḥattā*) 112–124
 passim, 210, 217
'imāla 199–200, 312n71
'in 13, 30, 32–33, 84n22, 86, 90, 93–94, 97, 100, 136n29
 (in *wa'in* 'though') 255n37
al-muxaffafa 255n37
al-nāfiya 84n22, 255
 indicative sentences denoting
 certainty 131, 136, 170, 192, 195, 316. See also *wāḡib*.
'inna 5n15, 13, 43n23, 51, 55n77, 84n22, 93, 97, 101, 204–205, 280

- 'innamā* (*ḥarf ibtidā'*) 71, 95, 203n31
'innamā (*ḥarf iḥtiqār*) 235
'innamā (*ḥarf iqtīṣār*) 235n175
inqiṭā' 113–114, 129–149 *passim*, 159–160, 170, 175–187 *passim*, 283–284, **304–307**, 308–310
'irāb xi, 30, 48, 125, 203n31, 297. See also *ḥarf 'irāb*.
ism pl. *'asmā'* 1n1, 83–84, 204n37, 297
ism fā'il pl. *'asmā' al-fā'ilīna* 311
ism fi'l pl. *'asmā' al-fi'l* 155, 163–164
ism kāna 237
'īsrāk 113–114, 124, 130–150 *passim*, 159–160, 170, 175–184 *passim*, 240, 284, 286, 299, 304–306, **307–310**
istiḥām 153–157, 290, 314
isti'nāf 132–133, 135, 152, 176, 283–284, 286–289, **306–307**, 309
al-istiqbāl (future) 25, 202, 221, 224. See also under action, time.
'itbā' 132, 150, 176, 306, **309**
ittiṣāl see *waṣl*
'iwaḍ 17, 28. See also *tanwīn al-'iwaḍ*.
'ixbār 32
'izhār 70, 303. See also *ẓāhir*, *muḡhar*.
- jaḥd* 314. See also *ḥarf jaḥd*, *jawāb al-jaḥd wal-istiḥām*, *juḥūd*, *li-* (*lām al-jaḥd*).
jam' (*ijtimā'*, meaning of) 177, 179n21, 188, 193, 299n9
jawāb 51, 60, 88–92, 105, 132, 133, 151–152, 189, **310**
al-'amr 151–152, 165, 273
'idā 243
 (in *jazm*) 143n56, 164–167, 272
al-istiḥām 143n57, 149
al-jaḥd wal-istiḥām 290
la'alla 150, 157
law 101, 152, 301n19
lawlā 300n14
al-naḥy 151, 153
al-nahy 151
naṣb 132
al-qasam 55, 96
al-ṣarṭ 32, 57, 133, 310
al-yamīn 115. See also *jawāb al-qasam*.
jazā' 88–90, 133, 154, 164, 285, **310–311**
jazm (mood) *passim*
juḥūd 154n104, 253n21. See also *li-* (*lām al-juḥūd*).
- ka-* 72, 75
kāf al-taṣbih see *ka-*
- kalām* 47, 273, 278, 281, 282, 313. See also *ḥadd al-kalām*.
kama (Ethiopic) 76
kamā 59, 72–77
kāna
al-nāqīṣa 237, 254
al-tāmma 237, 254
kasra 263–265
kay
 (meaning of *'aw*) 118–120, 124–125
 (meaning of *ḥattā*) 202–205, 209–213, 215, 217, 223, 240, 244
 See also *kamā*, *kaylā*, *kay li-*, *kaymā*, *li-* (*lām kay*), *likay*, *likaylā*, *likaymā*.
kaylā 59, 64, 70–71
kay li- 68–69
kaymā 60, 64–67, 70–72, 75–77
kaymah see *kaymā*
kī (Hebrew) 60
- la-* (*lām al-ibtidā'*) 263, 265
la- (*lām al-ta'kid*) 96–97, 101, 115, 311
la- (*li-* pronounced with *fathā*) 249, 263–266
la'alla 72–74, 150, 153, 156–158
laḡw 2n3
lam 27, 38–39, 44, 47, 255
lām 38
al-jīns 207n47
 See also under *la-*, *li-*.
lan
 followed by *jazm* 45–50
 followed by *raf'* 49
 See also etymology of *lan*.
 language, spoken see Bedouins speech, dialect
law 41, 49, 90, 97, 98, 101, 142, 152, 301n19
lawlā 41, 43, 300n14
li-
 followed by *jazm* 263
 in *'uridu li('an) taf'ala* 26, 249, 260–262, 267, 270
 (*lām al-'amr*) 146n72, 181, 182n35, 265
 (*lām al-'āqiba/al-ṣayrūra*) 249, 256–260, 264n75, 267, 270
 (*lām al-'idāfa*) 200, 263, 264
 (*lām al-jaḥd*) 253
 (*lām al-jarr*) 263, 269, 306n39
 (*lām al-juḥūd*) 193, 249, 252–256, 262–265, 267–270
 (*lām kay*) 46, 60, 249–254, 255n37, 256–259, 261–270
 (*lām al-ma'al*) 259n52
 (*lām al-ta'il*) 250

- (*lām al-tawkīd*) 253, 256
 of *mawḍi' al-ʿijāb* 250
 of *mawḍi' al-naḥy* 250
likay 59, 65–70
likaylā 59
likaymā 59, 70, 72
luḡa pl. *luḡāt* see dialect
- mā*
al-istifhāmīyya (interrogative particle) 242
al-kāffā 71, 75
al-maṣḍariyya 71–72
al-nāfiyya 255
al-zāʿida 64, 71
mabniyy ʿalā l-mubtadaʿ 130, 131n12, 286
al-māḍī (past) see under action, time
al-maḥḥūl maʿahu 188, 272, 314, 316
mawḍiʿ 19, 178, 204n37, 250, 253
 mood
 energetic/energetic *xinī*
 indicative (*rafʿ*) *passim*, 312
 jussive (*jazm*) *passim*, 311
 subjunctive (*naṣb*) *passim*, 312
mubtadaʿ 130, 131n10, 131n12, 306n36. See also *mabniyy ʿalā l-mubtadaʿ*.
muḍāriʿ *xin*3, 297, 311–312
muḍmar 298n4, 303. See also *ʿan muḍmara*.
mukāfaʿa 88–89, 311
muqaddar 90, 102. See also *taqdīr*.
murakkab (compound) 40–46, 58, 73n59, 84–89, 108
al-mustaqbal (future) see under action, time
muwalladūna 47
muḡhar 298n4. See also *ʿan muḡhara, ḡāhir*.
- n* (emphatic particle) 43–44, 58, 87
naḥy 50, 153–155, 161, 185, 235n173, 250, 253, 256, 270
naḥwiyy pl. *naḥwiyyūna* 189n76, 226
naḥy 153–156, 164
naql 47
naṣb (mood) *passim*
naṣq 96, 310
nidāʿ 99
- oath 55, 57, 64, 92, 94–99, 101, 136, 243
 orthography 53
 of *ʿan+lā* 30
 of *ʿidan* 80–83
 of *kaylā* and *kaymā* 71n49
- participle, active 113, 114, 276, 298, 311
 past see under action, time
 poetic license 6–8, 11, 35, 49, 57, 160–162, 170, 263, 272, 279
 present see under action, time
 pronoun 303n26
 attached 13, 17, 21, 25, 254
 independent 100, 132, 304, 305
 protasis 34, 57, 63, 64, 93, 96, 124, 133n17, 154, 242, 243, 283, 284, 287, 310, 311. See also *ṣarṭ*.
- qalb* 197, 226–232
qaṭʿ (synonym of *inqiṭāʿ*) 283, 284, 287, 288, 307
qiyās 39, 41, 49, 163n147, 164, 278
- rafʿ* (mood) *passim*
rubbamā 71–73, 227–230
- sa-* 17, 20, 23, 27, 32, 35, 49–53, 56
sabab 91, 133, 134, 313
sababiyya 61, 91, 133, 134, 234, 284, 285, 313
ṣādd (exceptional usage) xvii, 6–11, 14, 28, 32, 47, 103, 152n96, 160, 216, 264–265, 272, 276, 278, 282, 292–296
ṣāhid pl. *ṣawāhid* 159
samāʿ 163n147, 164
ṣarf 173–174, 176–177, 182–184, 193–195, 294, 313–315, 317
ṣarṭ 93, 124, 154, 310
laḥẓiyy 134
maʿnawiyy 134
 See also apodosis, *jawāb al-ṣarṭ*, protasis, *tawkīd al-ṣarṭ*.
- sawfa* 17, 23, 27, 32, 35, 37, 49, 50, 53
 speaker's desire see speaker's intention
 speaker's intention 14, 24, 29, 66, 95, 145, 147, 161, 180, 187, 201n22, 207, 219, 223–225, 234, 235n175, 244–246, 291, 295–296, 315
ṣudūd see *ṣādd*
sukūn 8n27, 48, 89, 146, 311
- tahdīd* 153–156, 185
ṭalab 153, 155–156, 185
taʿlīl see *ḥarf taʿlīl*, *ʿilla*, *li-* (*lām al-taʿlīl*)
tamannī 142–143, 147, 153–158, 164
tamṭīl 117, 303
tanwīn 81n7, 84–89, 103n104
 al-ʿiwaḍ 83n18, 83n19
taqdīr 34, 66, 69, 70, 90, 96–102, 117, 121, 122, 163–166, 268, 303, 315–316

tarajjī 153–158, 185

tašbih 147n74

'*an bimā* 9–10, 280

tawkid 69

al-šarṭ 89–91

See also *li-* (*lām al-tawkid*).

terminus a quo 218

terminus ad quem 218. See also *ḡāya*.

time

future (real, absolute) 5, 6, 10, 25, 26, 34, 39, 42, 46, 50, 51, 55n78, 62, 89, 90, 95, 98, 101, 142, 158, 202, 207, 208, 211, 212, 220–226, 241, 245, 246, 261, 262, 295, 296

future (relative) 211, 212, 221–226, 246, 295, 296

past 6, 26, 51, 89, 90, 101, 142n55, 150, 203–207, 211–214, 219–225, 231, 245–246, 261, 262, 295, 296

present (real, absolute) 5, 10, 25, 26, 51, 55n78, 62, 90, 91, 95, 100, 101, 203n29, 204, 211, 214, 216, 221–224, 245, 246, 295–296

present (relative) 219–222, 225, 246, 296

tumma 299–302, 305n32

wa-

(*wāw al-'aṭf*) 94, 191

(*wāw al-jam' / al-ijtimā'*) 176

(*wāw al-ma'ḡyya*) 177, 191

(*wāw al-šarf*) 176

al-wajh 139n40

wājib 136, 159–162, 192, 316. See also indicative sentences denoting certainty.

ḡayr wājib 31, 136, 154, 161, 162, 170, 175, 178, 192, 195, 235, 316

wallāhi see oath

waqf 48, 60n3, 66, 70, 82, 85, 89

waṣl 82, 89

wāw see under *wa-*

xabar (declarative sentence) 162, 316

xabar (predicate) 237

kāna 237

xilāf 121–123, 128, 168, 169, 171, 174, 314n85, 315, 316–317

ẓāhir 90, 102. See also '*an muḡhara*, *muḡhar*.

ẓanantu wa'axawātuḡ see '*aḡ'āl al-šakk wal-yaqīn*

ẓarf 33, 57n85, 99, 124, 243

INDEX OF QUR'ĀNIC QUOTATIONS¹

Qur'ān 2:35	132, 133, 148, 151	Qur'ān 17:76	93, 97, 103
Qur'ān 2:42	175, 180–181 , 184, 193, 313	Qur'ān 18:60	52
Qur'ān 2:83	274 , 279	Qur'ān 19:10	25n89
Qur'ān 2:95	53 , 54	Qur'ān 19:15	6
Qur'ān 2:102	159, 160	Qur'ān 19:26	55
Qur'ān 2:117	160n129	Qur'ān 19:35	160n129
Qur'ān 2:184	4, 5	Qur'ān 20:61	145 , 151
Qur'ān 2:188	184 , 185n50, 187	Qur'ān 20:81	151
Qur'ān 2:214	198, 208–209 , 211n64, 224n127	Qur'ān 20:89	18 , 19n68, 20, 24
Qur'ān 2:230	22	Qur'ān 20:91	54 , 208
Qur'ān 2:233	9–10 , 12, 14, 16	Qur'ān 22:31	153
Qur'ān 2:245	149 , 167, 289	Qur'ān 22:47	42, 46
Qur'ān 3:41	25	Qur'ān 22:63	162
Qur'ān 3:47	160n129	Qur'ān 23:93	97–98 , 104
Qur'ān 3:59	160n129	Qur'ān 26:19	90 , 104
Qur'ān 3:71	183n41, 184	Qur'ān 26:73	116
Qur'ān 3:73	3n8	Qur'ān 28:5	6
Qur'ān 3:111	289	Qur'ān 28:8	258 , 259, 260
Qur'ān 3:128	111, 114, 115, 118	Qur'ān 33:16	103–104
Qur'ān 3:142	179 , 182, 183, 193, 314	Qur'ān 35:36	137 , 167, 288 , 289, 290
Qur'ān 4:26	261	Qur'ān 36:82	160n129
Qur'ān 4:53	93, 96, 103	Qur'ān 37:7–8	276n19
Qur'ān 4:73	150 , 157	Qur'ān 39:12	260–261
Qur'ān 4:129	151	Qur'ān 39:58	152 , 301
Qur'ān 4:141	184 , 187	Qur'ān 39:64	273–274
Qur'ān 5:71	21 , 24, 26, 30	Qur'ān 40:36–37	150 , 157
Qur'ān 6:27	179–180 , 184, 190, 191n89	Qur'ān 40:68	160n129
Qur'ān 6:52	149 , 151	Qur'ān 42:51	111, 115, 300 , 301
Qur'ān 6:71	261 , 262	Qur'ān 45:19	55
Qur'ān 6:73	160n129	Qur'ān 47:35	185
Qur'ān 7:127	187	Qur'ān 48:16	111, 113 , 114, 115, 118, 119–120 , 285
Qur'ān 8:27	185	Qur'ān 57:11	149
Qur'ān 8:33	256 , 265	Qur'ān 57:29	18
Qur'ān 8:59	275	Qur'ān 61:8	262
Qur'ān 9:31	262	Qur'ān 62:7	54–55
Qur'ān 9:122	252	Qur'ān 68:9	147
Qur'ān 10:37	252	Qur'ān 73:20	18
Qur'ān 10:88	151 , 257	Qur'ān 74:6	275
Qur'ān 12:73	251	Qur'ān 75:25	21–22
Qur'ān 12:80	52 , 54, 208 , 245	Qur'ān 77:35–36	167, 284–285 , 288–290
Qur'ān 14:13	111, 114–115 , 118	Qur'ān 80:3–4	150 , 157
Qur'ān 14:31	273	Qur'ān 90:5	27
Qur'ān 14:44	152	Qur'ān 90:7	27
Qur'ān 14:46	255	Qur'ān 94:1	47
Qur'ān 16:40	160n129		

¹ Numerals in bold refer to pages where the verse is cited and translated.